DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 005 UD 017 273

AUTHOR	Laygo, Teresito M., Comp.
TITLE	What is Filipino?
INSTITUTION	Berkeley Unified School District, Calif. Asian American Bilingual Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 77
NOTE	75p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Asian American Bilingual Center, 2168 Shattuck Avenue, 3rd Floor, Berkeley, California 94704
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Change Agents; *Filipino Americans; Language Development; *Language Patterns; *Language Role; Language Skills; Language Styles; *Language Usage; *Language Variation
IDENTIFIERS	*Philippines; *Pilipino

ABSTRACT

This document presents some of the issues involved in deciding on a national language for the Philippines. It is noted that the Philippines needs a national language which would be accepted by most of the forty-five million Filipinos. If the trend continues for the next five years and if the trend in the Philippines to shift Pilipino (the national language that is known today) to Filipino (the national language that is still to be developed) likewise continues, will Filipino be different from Pilipino? Will the Pilipino language that children currently use be obsolete in years to come? Can the present Pilipino bilingual teacher teach in the language of the future Filipino immigrant child? What will be the implications of the language movement in the Philippines to the Pilipino bilingual programs in the U.S.? These and other related questions are addressed by several papers and by the proceedings of a workshop titled, "What is Pilipino?" The first major article discusses a language policy survey undertaken as a basis for making policy decisions and as a baseline for evaluating the results of any change in language policy. The second paper refutes the claim that the Pilipino language is inadequate to use in any scientific discussion. The third paper proposes a solution to non acceptance of Pilipino; the development of a new language called Filipino. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED145005

WHAT IS FILIPINO?

Compiled by
TERESITO M. LAYGO

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
The Berkeley Unified School District Asian American Bilingual Center
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

UD 017273

ASIAN AMERICAN BILINGUAL CENTER
2168 Shattuck Ave., Third Floor
Berkeley, California 94704

JANUARY, 1977

The activity which is the subject of this publication was supported in whole or part by the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

This publication was developed and printed with funds provided by Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

"Language-Planning Processes and the Language-Policy Survey in the Philippines" by Bonifacio P. Sibayan.
Reprinted from Can Language Be Planned edited by Joan Rubin and Bjorn H. Jernudd by permission of University Press of Hawaii.
Copyright © 1971.
University Press of Hawaii, 535 Ward Ave., Honolulu, HA 96814

"Ang 'Universal Approach' At Ang Wikang Pambansa Ng Pilipinas" by Ernesto Constantino.
Reprinted from Filipino o Pilipino? Mga Bagong Babasahin sa Pambansang Wika at Literatura edited by Ernesto Constantino, et al by permission of Rex Book Store.
Copyright © 1974.
Rex Book Store, 1977 Claro M. Recto Ave., Manila, Philippines.

"Amalgamating The Major Philippine Dialects Through The 'Maugnayin' Method" by Gonzalo del Rosario.
Reprinted by permission of Vice President Gonzalo del Rosario, Araneta University Foundation.
Copyright © 1972.
Gonzalo del Rosario, Araneta University Foundation, Victoneta Park, Malabon, Rizal, Philippines.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface ii

Language-Planning Processes and Language-Policy Survey in the Philippines
Bonifacio P. Sibayan,
Philippine Normal College 1

Amalgamating Major Philippine Dialects through the "Maugnayin" Method
Gonzalo del Rosario,
Araneta University Foundation 19

Ang "Universal Approach" at ang Wikang Pambansa ng Pilipinas
Ernesto Constantino,
University of the Philippines 25

Appendices

A. Proceedings of "What is Pilipino?" Workshop held on November 15, 1975 39

1. Workshop Summary
2. Schedule
3. Abstracts of the Talk by Panel of Speakers
4. Questionnaire Given to the Participants
5. Consolidated Response to the Questionnaire
6. Directory of Workshop Participants

B. Chronology of Events Leading to the Adoption of a Bilingual Policy in the Philippines 52

C. A Brief Summary of the Maugnayin Method of Amalgamation 56

D. Highlights of Constantino's Paper on "Universal Approach" 57

E. Bilingual Education in the Philippines 61

F. Types of Bilingual Programs in the Philippines . 67

PREFACE

In response to the matter of Pilipino as a language issue, the Asian American Bilingual Center, a materials development agency funded by the United States Office of Education under the Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII, sponsored a one-day workshop/conference on "What is Pilipino?" in Berkeley, California on November 15, 1975.

The participants to this workshop/conference rated the session a success in the sense that the main goal -- to develop a feedback network for the use of Pilipino in bilingual education -- had been achieved. However, the participants felt that the workshop/conference was not long enough to discuss the issues thoroughly in order to form a consensus. A second conference was planned in the spring of 1976 but it never materialized.

To fulfill a need for communication among Filipino bilingual educators, the Asian American Bilingual Center felt that some publication on the language issue of the Philippines would be beneficial.

It is a fact that most Filipino immigrants reside in California. It is also a fact that the Philippines is now experiencing a strong need to have a national language which would be accepted by almost all of the forty-five million Filipinos. Eighty-five percent of the twenty thousand Filipino immigrants coming to the United States yearly stay in California. If the trend continues for the next five years and if the trend in the Philippines to shift Pilipino (the national language that is known today) to Filipino (the national language that is still to be developed) likewise continues, will Filipino (language) be different from Pilipino? Will the Pilipino (based on Tagalog) that the child of today tries to maintain be foreign to the Philippines in the years to come? Can the present Pilipino bilingual teacher teach in the language of the future Filipino immigrant child? What will be the implications of the language movement in the Philippines to the Pilipino bilingual programs here in the United States?

This booklet, What is Filipino?, presents some of the positions on the language issue. Although it does not present direct answers to the questions enumerated above, it provides insights that will help to answer the above questions.

"Language-Planning Processes and Language-Policy Survey in the Philippines" lays the ground for a better understanding of the language issue.

Here, Dr. Bonifacio P. Sibayan discusses the language-policy survey undertaken by the Language Study Center of the Philippine Normal College as a basis for making policy decisions and as a baseline for evaluating the results of any change in language policy. He confines his discussion to the events in the postwar years.

One of the criticisms hurled at Pilipino is that it is inadequate to use in any scientific discussion. Gonzalo del Rosario claims that it is not. In his "Amalgamating the Major Philippine Dialects through the 'Maugnayin' Method", del Rosario shows how abundant the Pilipino scientific vocabulary is. In fact, the "Lupon sa Agham" has already published a Pilipino vocabulary of terms in the sciences.

Another criticism of Pilipino is that it is foreign to non-Tagalogs. Pilipino, it is said, is not merely Tagalog-based, but it is Tagalog. Non-Tagalogs do not want this language to be imposed on them, in spite of the fact that a great majority of Filipinos, Tagalogs and non-Tagalogs, speaks the Manila Tagalog.

Dr. Ernesto Constantino's "Ang 'Universial Approach' At Ang Wikang Pambansa ng Pilipinas" proposes a solution to non-acceptance of Pilipino -- the development of a new language called Filipino.

We have compiled and published these papers in the belief that they contributed to the solution related to the language problem in the Philippines. We thank the University of Hawaii Press for Dr. Sibayan's "Language-Planning Processes and Language Policy-Survey in the Philippines", Dr. Gonzalo del Rosario for his "Amalgamating the Major Philippine Dialects through the 'Maugnayin' Method", and Mr. and Mrs. Juan Fontelera for "Ang 'Universal Approach' at ang Wikang Pambansa ng Pilipinas" by Dr. Ernesto Constantino

LANGUAGE-PLANNING PROCESSES AND THE LANGUAGE-POLICY SURVEY IN THE PHILIPPINES

BONIFACIO P. SIBAYAN
President, Philippine Normal College, Manila

INTRODUCTION

A commission that examined the achievements of the public school system after twenty-five years of education in English claimed in 1925:

> . . . there is little or no tendency toward building up a common language through a fusion of all or several of the dialects.[1]

Fifteen years later, the following was said on the same subject by Hayden (1942):

> . . . in a little more than four years, by an orderly, rational process, the Philippine Commonwealth has laid the foundations for the establishment of a native national language. From the administrative and scholarly standpoint this is a surprising achievement. Even more remarkable are the facts that one of the Philippine languages was selected as the basis of the national languages without acrimonious struggle and that this decision has been popularly accepted without serious protest by the other linguistic groups in the Islands (p.585).

Hayden generously says that it took less than four years for the Filipinos to build the foundations of a national language. It is more accurate to say, however, that it took more than five years. This covers the period from February 8, 1935, when the Constitution was adopted, which provided that steps should be taken by the National Assembly for the development of a national language up to June 7, 1940, when a law was passed declaring the national language to be an official language on July 4, 1946.[2]

Furthermore, the same commission (Monroe, 1925) commented as follows on the use of the Philippine languages (dialects):

> . . . the introduction of the dialects as the language of instruction would be a divisive influence (p. 26).

In 1957, the policy-determining body of the Republic of the Philippines, the Board of National Education (1958), decided:

> The Board adopts as a policy the use of the native language as the medium of instruction in Grades 1 and 2 in all public and private schools and urges the school authorities to take practical steps towards its implementation.

It is understandable why the recognition of the value of the local languages in the life of the people took a much longer time to develop. The vernaculars do not have the urgency that a national language demands in the affairs of the nation. Even now, after more than a decade of their use in the schools, their value is still being questioned in some quarters. In fact, the vernacular is still not used in many exclusive private schools.[3]

On the other hand, the national language was seriously being considered as the language of instruction in the elementary and secondary schools by 1967. A Committee on Curriculum of the Board of National Education proposed that Pilipino be used as the medium of instruction.

This proposal, however, did not seem very popular.[4] The wisdom of a sudden change in the language of instruction to Pilipino from the vernaculars (in Grades 1 and 2) and from English (in Grades 3 through high school) was questioned by many responsible educators. It was obvious that important changes in policy were inspired by nationalistic tendencies and not by objective data. This situation created the need for a study. The Language Study Center of the Philippine Normal College proposed that a language-policy survey be undertaken as a basis for making policy decisions and as a baseline for evaluating the results of any change in language policy. This proposal was presented to the Board of National Education, which endorsed it in March 1968.

I shall confine my discussion only to the events in the postwar years since the processes that led to the adoption of the national language have been discussed in detail in several works.[5]

BEFORE THE SURVEY: YEARS OF FERMENT AND DEBATE

I list below the events that I shall discuss in some detail:

1948-54:	the Iloilo experiment on the use of the vernacular as the language of instruction;[6]
1950-68:	the coming of age in the Philippines of linguistics and second-language teaching;
June 3, 1955:	the establishment of the Board of National Education, which determines educational policy matters in the Philippines;

July 1957:	the start of the use of vernaculars as languages of instruction in the first two grades;
1960-66:	two more experiments in Iloilo and Rizal;
1967-68:	the word-war--the Congress investigates the procedures and ways of developing the national language; purists versus anti-purists; the use of conversational Pilipino in place of "pure Tagalog" by Taliba; orthography and Katas;
1967:	proposal for the use of Pilipino as the language of instruction.

Experiment on the Use of Vernaculars: 1948-54

The use of vernaculars as media of instruction in the elementary school was tried in Iloilo in 1948-54. The experiment grew out of many factors and desires, the most important of which, according to Dr. Jose V. Aguilar, was the need to improve the life of the average Filipino citizen through the community school. It was thought that, with the use of the vernacular, both parent and child would benefit because what is learned in school could be discussed with parents and because what is happening in the community could be discussed in school. The experiment proved the superiority of the vernaculars as the language of instruction in the initial stage of education, in terms of what the child should learn, and in his social growth. By 1956-57, twenty-two school divisions were given permission to use the vernaculars.[7]

Establishment of the Board of National Education

Up until 1954, there had been no single body charged with determining language policy. The goal of the development of a national language was set by the Constitution, and its details were elaborated by legislative acts, the President of the Philippines, and the Institute of National Language.[8]

In June, 1955, an Act of Congress created the Board of National Education. The Board is authorized "to formulate general education objectives and policies, coordinate offerings, activities and functions of all educational institutions in the country with a view to carrying out the provisions of the constitution and to accomplishing an integrated, well-rounded nationalistic and democracy-inspired educational system in the Philippines."[9]

One of the most difficult problems that confronted the members of the Board of National Education had been the conflicting views regarding the use and function in the schools of the vernaculars, the national language, Pilipino,[10] English, and Spanish. In 1957, however, after almost two years of study and discussion, the Board issued the Revised Educational Program, which provided the use of the vernaculars as languages of instruction. The Secretary of Education thereafter directed that

both public and private schools were to take practical steps in the use of the vernaculars in the first two grades. Pilipino was to be taught as a subject from Grade 1 through college (undergraduate degree), while English was to be taught informally in the first two grades and used as the language of instruction from Grade 3 through college.[11] Such has been the language system till now.

Linguistics and Second-Language Teaching: 1950-69

In 1949, the teaching of English as a second language was introduced to the Philippines by Clifford H. Prator, who was on a Fulbright lectureship at the time. He summarized his impressions, experiences, and recommendations in his monograph, Language Teaching in the Philippines. Prator's work was mainly responsible in starting a movement that not only affected the teaching of English but also stimulated a host of other interests as follows: keener attention to Philippine vernaculars; the use of lingustics in language teaching; the study of lingustics as a subject; the establishment of academic programs in applied linguistics mostly on the graduate level; the writing of materials on language teaching, with the use of linguistic findings; the education of teachers, supervisors, and administrators in linguistics and language teaching; and the establishment of centers for the study of language, such as the Language Study Center of the Philippine Normal College, in 1962.

It was also during this period that the need for teaching materials was felt. The first prototype teacher's guide in the teaching of English as a second language was written in 1956-58 in the Bureau of Public Schools.[12] This guide was to be revised later by the Philippine Center for Language Study (PCLS), which was established under the auspices of the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), at the request of the Department of Education and with funds from the Rockefeller Foundation.

The UCLA-PCLS program was significant to the movement because it assisted (1) in the training and education in the United States of more than a hundred teachers, supervisors, and administrators; (2) in the production of models of teaching manuals and materials, including materials on the teaching of Pilipino as a second language in non-Tagalog-speaking areas; (3) in the introduction of courses in second-language teaching at the Philippine Normal College; and (4) in conducting experiments on the use of English, Pilipino, and the vernaculars.

Interest in linguistics and language teaching has also led to added concern in allied fields such as psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and social psychology. The increasing number of academic institutions offering courses in linguistics and language teaching and the support of thirty scholarships in this field by the Department of Education at the Language Study Center are among the more important developments towards language-planning processes to date.

Two Experiments: Rizal and Iloilo II, 1960-66

Two large-scale experiments (Davis, 1967) were conducted jointly by the Philippine Center for Language Study and the Bureau of Public Schools in 1960-66. One was the Rizal experiment, which involved thirty teachers and 1,490 pupils in thirty schools for six years. This study showed (1) that it is advisable to introduce reading in English in Grade 1 (in the fourth month), instead of in Grade 2 as advocated by a number of authorities in the field of second-language teaching; and (2) that, of the three schemes in the use of English and the vernacular in the first six years of school, a) the pupils taught in an all-English curriculum in Grades 1 to 6 produced the best results; b) those taught in the vernacular for four years and then in English in Grades 5 and 6 were the next best; and (c) the pupils taught in the prevailing scheme of two years in the vernacular and English in Grades 3 through 6 came out the poorest.

Apparently, the results of this study have not been considered seriously by those who are in a position to make curriculum changes. I remember that when the results were coming in, a series of ten meetings were conducted to discuss the results with Fredrick Davis, consultant to the experiment. Some of the most higly placed persons in the Department of Education attended the conferences. There was a great deal of dismay over the fact that the English curriculum proved most effective. The discussions also brought out the disparity in the three systems: the teachers in the English curriculum were better trained and the materials were better prepared.

The other experiment, the Iloilo II study, justified the use of the vernacular and the simultaneous teaching of two second languages, English and Pilipino, in non-Tagalog-speaking provinces. Again, the experiment proved the value of adequately trained teachers, carefully prepared materials, and excellent supervision. This study disproved the notion that the teaching or use of three languages simultaneously would confuse the child.

The Word-War of Pilipino: 1967-68

A speech delivered on the floor of the House of Representatives by Congressman Aguedo F. Agbayani,[13] chairman of the Committee on Education and member of the Board of National Education, virtually started the word-war on Pilipino. Congressman Agbayani accused the Institute of National Language of failure to develop a national language; namely, the borrowing of words and the spelling of these borrowed words in Pilipino. The word-war that followed was to be a war in two senses: the fact that the word output from the congressional investigation on the evolvement of Pilipino and those that appeared in print in the newspapers and magazines by people from all walks of life was tremendous; and the fact that the debate concentrated on what words to borrow and how to spell them.[14]

Congressman Agbayani mentioned the "communication gap" or the "crisis of understanding" between the government and the people. He attributed this problem to a number of causes: the use of difficult language called "officialese" in communicating ideas; the use of English by mass media; and, worst of all, the use of "pure" Tagalog by newspapers. He cited the Taliba as an exception. Taliba is the largest national language newspaper in Manila, which started to use "conversational or colloquial Filipino" -- simple Tagalog, which has borrowings from English and Spanish.[15]

The Taliba style was to be discussed by newspaper editors and columnists and commented on by many people in the letters-to-the-editor columns. It was evident that the majority were in favor of the anti-purists' brand of Pilipino, the Taliba style.

In response to Agbayani's speech, the House voted unanimously "to re-examine the procedures being followed by the government in evolving a national language understood by all Filipinos."[16] The congressional hearings that followed were conducted by committees on education and national language and brought forth the "purists" and the "anti-purists". The anti-purists (whom I prefer to call popularizers), led by Geruncio Lacuesta, a lawyer and publisher of a magazine called Katas, were most active in the hearings.

Lacuesta used to be of the same school of thought as most of those in the Institute of National Language until he started deviating from the twenty-letter abakada and began advocating the spelling of borrowed words the way they are spelled in the lending languages. This practice must have prompted the director of the Institute to recommend that Katas be excluded from the approved reading list of the Bureau of Public Schools. (With government money, the public schools can subscribe to newspapers and magazines or buy books that are on the list approved by the Bureau.) Lacuesta has since been on the war path. He lobbied for the passage of a bill calling for the abolition of the Institute and the creation of an Academia ng Wikang Filipino. The bill did not prosper in Congress.[17]

The language debate subsided by the middle-half of 1967. In July 1968, the language problem was again being debated in the papers. Congressman Agbayani wrote an article, "A Realistic Approach to the Language Problem", in which he summarized the results of the congressional hearings a year earlier. He concluded by saying:

> All controversial questions on the national language, except the question on the alphabet, have already been settled by law. The "combatants" in the language "war" must, therefore, lay down their arms. They and we must utilize our efforts and energies for the accelerated implementation of the decisions we have already made, which are embodied in the law . . .[18]

It is not clear to this writer why Congressman Agbayani thinks that only the alphabet remains controversial.

A Proposal for the Use of Pilipino

The Committee on Curriculum of the Board of National Education submitted a modified and less ambitious version of their original recommendation for the use of Pilipino. The members recommended that Pilipino be used only in the first four grades of school. Because their plans were set back by one year, they now want to start in 1970-71 instead of 1969-70. It is not known when the Board will start considering the recommendation. Congressman Agbayani has publicly stated that the status quo should be maintained pending results of the Philippine Normal College studies (meaning the Language Policy Survey).

THE LANGUAGE POLICY SURVEY

Background of the Survey

As stated earlier, the Committee on Curriculum of the Board of National Education proposed that Pilipino be used as the language of instruction starting in the school year 1969-70. Pilipino was to be used in the first year of school and then extended one grade every year thereafter so that, by the school year 1972-73, all primary grades would be taught in Pilipino, with English as a subject. By 1973-74, Pilipino was to be the medium of instruction in Grade 5 and extended one grade every year to the fourth year of high school in social studies, history, health, civics, and government. Science, mathematics, and allied subjects were to be taught in English.

The proposal also included a crash program, calling for the preparation of textbooks and teaching materials from January to March, the training of key teachers from April to June, and the training of all teachers from July to September 1968. The period to June 1969 was to be devoted to the printing of textbooks and teaching materials. The training of teachers at the district, municipal, and barrio levels was also to take place during this period. By July 1969, Pilipino was to be used in Grade 1 in all subjects in all schools.

It was obvious from the proposal that the proponents disregarded the realities of textbook and teaching-materials production. They were unaware, moreover, of the length of time and difficulty involved in training teachers. Even more serious than oversight was the fact that the committee did not take into account the opinions and attitudes of the people who were to be involved in the change.

The proposal met considerable opposition. The outcry from a group of educators literally forced the committee to call for hearings on the proposal. At this point, the Committee on Curriculum was constrained to withdraw its recommendation, and it created an ad hoc committee to study the matter further.

It became clear from the discussions that such a radical shift in the language of instruction in the schools should take into consideration what the people thought about the proposal. This gave the staff of the Language Study Center the idea of conducting a language-policy survey.

Although there had been a number of surveys (Monroe, 1925, pp. 24-28; Swanson, 1960, pp. 93-111) involving the schools in the Philippines, partly on language, there was never a large-scale survey in depth on the people's attitudes towards language.

Scope

The survey was intended to gather data to answer the following general questions:

1. Attitudes towards language[19]

   a. What language do people prefer or expect their educational system to use?
   b. What connection do people see between language and occupational or social advancement?
   c. What language or languages do people actually use in their daily communications?

2. Data on the educational system

   a. What languages are actually being used in the schools as the media of instruction or as auxiliary media of instruction? What is the competence of the teachers in these languages?
   b. What study materials are available to the students? In what languages are these written, by whom, and where were they printed?
   c. What subjects are best taught in what languages?

3. Data on mass communication media

   a. What languages are used in mass communication media?
   b. What facilities are available for mass information, and how effective are they?

4. Data on the status of six of the major languages

   a. How standardized are the six major languages?

The Staff

At the start of the survey, the staff consisted of the senior staff of the Language Study Center with Dr. Fe T. Otanes, acting director and linguist, as staff leader.[20]

Data-collecting Instruments

Six data-collecting instruments (five questionnaires and fifty-item word lists) were developed for the survey. The questionnaires were divided into the following populations: householder, teacher, publisher, radio station, and adolescents. The word lists were for Bikol, Cebuano, Hiligaynon, Ilocano, Tagalog (Pilipino), and Waray.

Of the questionnaires, the householder questionnaire is the most extensive and important. It consists of two parts: four pages to yield general information on biography, economy (type of dwelling, furniture, etc.), and the like, and some questions that are asked if the respondent does not qualify for further interview; twenty pages to yield information on the respondent's and his family's language background, his opinions and preferences on language use, his attitudes on variations in language, his knowledge and preferences of language in the schools, and more detailed information on his economic and social standing.

The teacher questionnaire consists of two parts: seven pages are used to record information on the actual work of the interviewee, his background and competence, the languages he actually uses in teaching, and the languages he favors or discourages for teaching certain subjects; six pages are used for gathering information on textbooks, supplementary materials, periodicals, reference books, teacher-prepared materials, and radio or television (or both) programs used in teaching various subjects. The quantity, date of publication (for books and periodicals), source (radio or television), the frequency of use, and the language used are recorded.

The publisher questionnaire has two parts: the first part yields information on the type of publishing business, the kind of materials produced, and the length of time the firm has been in operation; the second part is used to record information on printing facilities and capabilities.

The radio station questionnaire consists of eight pages for recording facilities and programs and for recording how widespread these programs are.

The adolescents questionnaire was aimed at collecting information on language background, language skills, language preferences, language uses, attitudes towards languages; and information on their educational and social background.

Interview Areas

The Philippines was divided into 21 regions, consisting of approximately 12 communities to each region except Manila, which was divided into 23 communities. A total of 259 communities were surveyed. The communities were selected for each region with the assistance of the director of the Bureau of Census and Statistics and on the basis of how well these communities reflected the demographic characteristics of the region. Except for Manila and the capitals of the provinces, most of the communities were smaller population centers (barrios).

Respondents

An average of four householders from the poblacions[21] and three from each of the barrios were interviewed, giving a total of 2,376 householders.

Selection of householders was based on their proximity to important landmarks in the town, the type of house they lived in, the length of residence (at least five years or five of the last eight years), their age (less than fifty years old), and on the fact that they must have children who have had some schooling or who are of preschool age.

An interviewee was rejected if he did not meet the above criteria; if any member of his family was a school teacher in the elementary or secondary schools; or if a relative of his had been interviewed in the same barrio.

Teachers were interviewed in at least one public and one private elementary school where the children of most of the householder-interviewees study. In elementary schools, teachers in Grades 1, 3, and 5 (or 4) were interviewed. In places where there was only a private high school and no private elementary school, first-year teachers were interviewed. A total of 2,342 teachers were interviewed.

A total of 1,577 adolescents, between the ages of twelve and eighteen, a total of 130 radio and television-station owners, and 194 publishers and printers were also interviewed.

Interviewers: Selection, Training, and Compensation

Twenty-three interviewers or field-workers (twelve males and eleven females), all graduates with either an A.B. or B.S. in Commerce, were selected. Teachers were not employed.[22] The field workers were given fifteen days of training beginning in April 1968. Thirteen days were spent according to a daily schedule that covered the following: phonetics, consisting mainly of training in notating the word lists; interview techniques; word-elicitation techniques; study of the various questionnaires, including translation of the questions into the language (dialect) of the interview. Two days were spent for practice-interviews in Manila and the suburbs.

Data Collection

The survey was officially started on May 17, 1968. The field workers tried interviewing in the Manila region before they were sent out to their respective regions. Interviewers were assigned to their native regions. A standard procedure was followed by the interviewer upon arrival in a community: he was to register with the police department and then call on the mayor and the superintendent of schools to whom he was to present several letters of introduction and a copy of a letter on the nature of his work, which had been sent earlier to the mayor. Interviews were recorded in English. All householders started by answering the first general portion of the questionnaire, and, if acceptable, according to the criteria for further interviewing, they answered the rest of the questions. Those who are native speakers of one of the six languages in the word lists were requested to give responses to these. In addition to native speakers of Tagalog, non-native speakers who claimed to speak the language fluently were asked to respond. In cases where not one of the householders was a native speaker of any of the six languages in the word lists, school teachers were asked instead. Word lists were also collected from adolescents. The number of word lists collected are shown in Table 1, according to language and respondent.

In addition to data gathered through the questionnaires, each interviewer completed a community data information sheet. A daily record was also kept.

Supervision

To insure the correctness of data, three supervisors were assigned to work with all interviewers. Follow-up work was conducted by the supervisors, especially during the first phase of the survey. Names and addresses of respondents were taken from the questionnaires, and then a sample of respondents were contacted and asked whether they were actually interviewed. One interviewer was released because he did not satisfy the standards of the job. The supervisors also took charge of all field arrangements.

All interviewers returned to Manila at least twice during the six-month period. During the first week of October, a regional conference was held in Cebu City.

The development of instruments, training of interviewers, and actual gathering of data from all over the islands took approximately eight months.

Table 1: Word Lists Collected and Tabulated by Language and Respondent

Language	Householder	Teacher	Adolescent	Total
Bicolano	164	0	144	308
Cebuano	413	19	281	713
Hiligaynon	216	18	185	419
Ilocano	353	18	195	566
Tagalog	726	72	522	1,320
Waray	143	0	71	214
Total	2,015	127	1,398	3,540

Data-processing and Analysis

Coding for computer analysis was started in November and is now still going on. All data are coded and punched to cover later unpredictable needs. The questions to be answered first and for which appropriate computer programs are being written are the following:

1. What is the attitude of the people as a whole and by regions towards the vernacular, Pilipino, and English as the language of instruction in the primary, intermediate, and secondary schools?
2. Which language is best suited for which subjects in the schools?
3. Which languages are needed for success in certain occupations?
4. Are parents aware of the languages being used to teach their children?
5. Why do people want their children to speak Pilipino, English, or the vernacular?
6. What form of Pilipino is most acceptable?
7. What are the language preferences of Filipinos for speaking, reading, listening, and writing?
8. Is instruction in English a reason strong enough for sending a child to a private school?
9. Is Tagalog a different language from Pilipino?
10. Who should determine the language of instruction in schools?

Initial Findings

Partial data on 221 respondents (130 householders and 91 teachers) in Manila and the suburbs was analyzed to offer some preliminary findings.

Languages for Contact and Reading

The favored language used in speaking to relatives (contacts) is Tagalog, while the favored language of contact in writing is English. It is interesting that a number of people who report such "major" languages as Bikol, Pampango, and Ilocano as their first language do not use these languages as language of contact with relations, at least for the first three contacts listed.[23]

It is possible that many of these people use either English or Tagalog now. This would seem to confirm the view that non-Tagalog-speaking Filipinos who migrate to Manila would sooner or later have minimum use of their ethnic language.

Regarding reading, most Manila respondents report that they have read in Taglog and in English (which is to be expected) because most publications are in these two languages. More people report reading in Tagalog than in English, which seems contrary to a common belief that there are more people who read in English because of the reputedly large circulation of newspapers and magazines in English.

Language Spoken Best

Tagalog was reported as the language spoken best by 158 out of 221 respondents. Ilocano was reported by 7, and other languages by fewer people.

Languages Needed for Success in Occupations

What language or combination of languages is felt to be needed for success in certain occupations? One who knows only Pilipino would succeed as carpenter, farmer, fisherman, housewife, and seller (market). A knowledge of Pilipino and English is considered necessary for success as clerk, physician, electrician, lawyer, mayor, midwife, policeman, postman, priest, secretary, and seller (big stores). One who knows only Spanish or only a non-Tagalog Philippine language would not succeed in any of the sixteen occupations listed. On the other hand, the combination of Pilipino, English, and Spanish would mean success for lawyers, priests, and physicians. This would seem to show the influence of Spanish on the learned professions. The only occupation where one might succeed if one knew only English is that of a clerk. This may be attributed to the fact that the main language of the government is English.

While almost a third of the respondents think that a combination of Pilipino and English would be needed for success in

carpentry, not one respondent thinks that a combination of Pilipino and Spanish would be needed. Success is practically assured in all the occupations if one knows a combination of Pilipino and English. And if one were to choose only one language for success, it would be Pilipino.[24]

NOTES

1. Monroe (1925, p. 24). This is popularly known in the Philippines as the Monroe Survey Report.

2. Commonwealth Act No. 570, June 7, 1946. English, Spanish, and Pilipino are official languages. Pilipino is the national language.

3. Two reasons why private schools are allowed to use English instead of the vernaculars in the first two grades are: (1) the main purpose of the use of the vernacular is to assure the child's literacy if he should drop out, though most of the children in private schools do not drop out; and (2) parents may exercise the right to choose the education they should give their children. (Private communication, Dr. Narciso Albarracin, director of Private Schools.)

4. Maximo Ramos, president of the Philippine Association for Language Teaching, wrote on the subject: "You're not supposed to know, but a plan now close to launching stage is in the works to make Tagalog (Pilipino) the teaching medium for all but two or three subjects in the public schools . . . By design or otherwise, only a handful of people in this supposedly open society are in on the scheme. . ." Maximo Ramos, "Pilipino or Bust," Philippines Free Press, July 6, 1969, p. 4 ff.

5. For the most complete account, see Frei (1959). For a shorter account, see Hayden (1950, chapter 24).

6. For evaluative reports on the experiment, see Bureau of Public Schools, Manila: Bulletin, nos. 9, 12, 14, 16, series 1953; no. 6, series 1954; and no. 9, series 1955. For an interpretative account of the experiment, see Ramos, Aguilar, and Sibayan (1967).

7. Venancio Trinidad, former director of the Bureau of Public Schools, before the Board of National Education April 24, 1956. Stenographic notes of the proceedings of the Board of National Education.

8. Republic Act No. 1124, June 16, 1954. The Board was composed of fifteen members: the Secretary of Education; the Chairman of the Committee on Education in the House of Representatives; the Chairman of the Committee on Education of the Senate; the Director of Public Schools; the Director of the Bureau of Private Schools; the President of the University of the Philippines; the Chairman of UNESCO, Philippines; a representative of labor; a representative of

industry and management; a representative of agriculture; a representative of the Catholic Education Association of the Philippines; a representative of Mohammedan and other cultural minority groups; a representative of the Association of Christian Schools and Colleges (Protestant); a representative of the Philippine Association of Colleges and Universities; and a representative of the teaching profession. The present membership as provided in the 1965 law consists of the Secretary of Education and seven members.

9. Republic Act No. 4372, June 19, 1965.

10. The term, "Pilipino", was officially adopted to refer to the national language beginning August 13, 1959. See Department Order No. 7, series 1959, Department of Education, Manila. The spelling of Pilipino with a "P" has not been accepted by a number of Filipinos.

11. See Department Order No. 1, series 1957, Department of Education, Manila. Enclosed also in Circular No. 3, series 1957, Bureau of Public Schools, Manila.

12. By Bonifacio P. Sibayan and Fe Manza. For complete series, see Teacher's Guide in Teaching English in Grade 1, Memorandum, nos. 111, 153, series 1957; nos. 32, 58, 81, 95, 136, series 1958. Manila Bureau of Public Schools.

13. See Aguedo F. Agbayani, Development and Evolution of Our National Language, Manila Times, March 10, 1967.

14. This controversy on spelling proves Haugen's (1966) contention that in LP the written form of language, rather than speech, is primary: ". . . in the study of LP we shall have to . . . consider writing primary and speech secondary" (p. 53).

15. After the switch from "pure" Tagalog to "conversational Filipino", the daily circulation of the paper rose from 19,000 (January 1967) to 30,000 in a month's time. On June 30, 1969, the audited circulation (after return of unsold copies) was 77,096, and in January 1969, two years later, the average daily circulation had gone up to 122,853. This is an indication of how readable the conversational Filipino style had become.

16. See Manila Times, March 7, 1967, p. 1.

17. House Bill No. 11367.

18. Manila Times, September, 28, September 30, 1968.

19. A small attempt at an attitude survey was made in 1965 by me. See Bonifacio P. Sibayan, Implementation of Language Policy, in Ramos, Aguilar, and Sibayan (1967).

20. Other senior staff members were: Dr. Richard Tucker, psycholinguist; Dr. Tommy R. Anderson, linguist; Mr. Jack Wigfield, language archives supervisor; Professor Benjamin M. Pascual, English professor and lawyer; and Miss Aurora L. Sore, field supervisor. Dr. Robert C. Gardner, social psychologist and computer expert, joined the staff in the later half of August 1968. I joined the staff upon my return to Manila in the later part of September 1968. Anderson and Tucker terminated their connection with the Center in the middle of December 1968. The staff presently analyzing the data consists of Fe T. Otanes, Robert C. Gardner, Jack Wigfield, Aurora L. Sore, Edilberto P. Dagot, Don M. Taylor, and myself.

21. The poblacion is the center of a municipality where the seat of government is located, in contrast to the barrio, which is outside the poblacion.

22. The interviewers were paid P300 a month plus P14 per diem while in the field (P3.90=U.S. $1.00). An instructor who has an M.A. in a state college such as the Philippine Normal College earns P306 a month as starting salary.

23. Respondents were asked to name family relations not living in their community with whom they maintained contact. The questionnaire allowed for as many as seven family relations (contacts). Only the first three contacts were analyzed.

24. Pilipino is used here to mean Tagalog. In the questionnaire, the term "Pilipino", was used. Only one respondent specifically listed Tagalog as a language needed for success in the occupations.

REFERENCES

Board of National Education, 1958. General Education Policies. Quezon City: Phoenix Press.

Bright, William, ed. 1966. Sociolinguistics. Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference, 1964. Janua Linguarum, Series Maior, 20. The Hague: Mouton.

Davis, Fredrick B. 1967. Philippine Language Teaching Experiments. Quezon City: Phoenix Press.

Frei, Ernest J. 1959. The Historical Development of the Philippine National Language. Manila: Bureau of Printing.

Haugen, Einar. 1966. Linguistics and Language Planning. In Bright, 50-71.

Hayden, Joseph R. 1942 (reissue 1950). The Philippines: A Study in National Development. New York: Macmillan.

Monroe, Paul, chairman. 1925. Survey of the Educational System of the Philippines. Manila: Bureau of Printing.

Prator, Clifford H. 1950. Language Teaching in the Philippines. Manila: United States Educational Foundation in the Philippines.

Ramos, Maximo; Aguilar, Jose V.; and Sibayan, Bonifacio P. 1967. The Determination and Implementation of Language Policy. Philippine Center for Language Study, no. 2. Quezon City: Alemar-Phoenix.

Swanson, J. Chester, staff leader. 1960. Survey of the Public Schools of the Philippines--1960. Manila: Carmelo and Bauermann.

AMALGAMATING THE MAJOR PHILIPPINE DIALECTS THROUGH THE "MAUGNAYIN" METHOD

GONSALO DEL ROSARIO
Dean, Graduate Institute of Pilipino
Araneta University Foundation
Chief Researcher, Lupon Sa Agham

There are many words from various Philippine dialects as well as from foreign languages incorporated by the Lupon Sa Agham into the technical and scientific vocabulary of Pilipino using the maugnayin terms already being used in certain classes at the Araneta University Foundation, at the University of the Philippines and in several other institutions of learning.

The "maugnayin" method developed by the UNESCO-initiated Lupon sa Agham, is so far the only effective and realistic way of accomplishing that long-cherished but often misunderstood dream of amalgamating the principal dialects of the Philippines into a single dynamic national language.

Unfortunately, despite the wishful thinking of some patriotic and well-intentioned people, languages cannot be fused together just by indiscriminately mixing up their grammars and vocabularies on equal basis. It would take many hundreds of years, if ever, for such a raw mixture to become cohesive enough for practical use. Languages simply do not behave like vegetables in a stew.

On the other hand the maugnayin approach, systematically applied, would give us a modern, consistent and powerful and national language within ten years, starting with Pilipino as we have it now, and progressively incorporating important contributions from the other Philippine dialects. The Lupon sa Agham, a civic group composed of 60 scientists, educators and professionals in the major fields of science and technology, stands ready to help, as it has already helped during the past six years.

The term "maugnayin" comes from the Tagalog root-word "ugnay" meaning connection or relation. With the prefix-suffix pattern ma- -in (which has cognates in Visayan and other dialects), the resulting term denotes "consistency and interrelatedness". For example, the related concepts denoted by "init", "mainit", "kainitan" and "init-sukat" are expressed by completely consistent (maugnayin) terms in Pilipino. All of them contain the root-word "init". Their English equivalents heat, hot, temperature and thermometer are not lexically consistent (dimaugnayin).

Among elementary school children, learning a science concept

is achieved fastest when a "maugnayin" language is used as the teaching medium. The interconnections among "maugnayin" terminology increase the association of ideas, thereby accelerating the learning process. On the other hand, learning is retarded by a "dimaugnayin" teaching medium such as English, especially when used with children not native speakers of the language. This is one of the things we have found out in the first grade experimental class at the Araneta University. Many Filipinos overlook this fact because they think about the learning process in terms of adults like themselves who already possess a working knowledge of the English language. The average Filipino, who according to the government is a statistical "third grader", tends to forget the trials and tribulations he underwent during his elementary school days just to get a smattering of English without, at the same time, imbibing substantial learning, especially in the sciences.

Even for children who are native speakers of English, technical terminology in English is somewhat a hindrance to their quick learning because terms consist of stems and combining forms, not of the children's home language, but of Latin and Greek, which are not spoken in the homes of English and American children. This is a basic defect that the English-speaking nations may have to correct in the future to stay competitive. They have advanced so far in spite of this handicap because of other factors.

The high degree of consistency of the Japanese language is the biggest single factor behind Japan's phenomenal progress in science and technology. In general, Japanese elementary school graduates know more science than their American or English counterparts. I know this from direct personal observation in Japan.

Under the "maugnayin" approach, amalgamation is to be done around one main language base supplemented by several additional language bases, with vocabulary selections done in accordance with the maugnayin, an internally consistent vocabulary in science and technology. Why in science and technology? Because in these fields words and terms are taught in a prescriptive and authoritative manner. In science teaching, a mild form of imposition is accepted with good humor. The amalgamation of vocabularies, whenever this is necessary, has greater chances of early success in technical matters. Then, later on, the amalgamative effect would leak out to the marketplace, to the main-street, to ordinary conversations -- just as today laymen talk about Einstein's Theory of Relativity without having an insight into the mathematical relationships involved.

A "maugnayin" vocabulary is one in which basic and abstract concepts (such as heat, gravity and power) are expressed by terms derived as much as possible from root words of the dialects being amalgamated, and from the affixed and combining forms of the core language. Non-basic, concrete concepts, such as names of plants,

planetary bodies, elements, measures, materials, etc., may of course just be borrowed from foreign languages whenever the local dialects do not have names for them, such as "akasya", "Marte", "oksihen", "metro", "plastik", etc.

In the Philippine situation, the "maugnayin" method calls for developing the Filipino national language based principally on Tagalog, especially with respect to grammar, and secondarily on the other major dialects, especially with respect to vocabulary. In this way Visayan, Ilokano, Bicol, Maranaw and the other major dialects will play important roles in the formation and development of the national language.

But again, the amalgamation of vocabularies cannot be done haphazardly. Two different levels must be recognized.

On the ordinary or colloquial level, the basis of vocabulary amalgamation would be popular usage. Whatever words tend to be spoken by the national majority should be taken as standard Pilipino regardless of whether these are from Tagalog, Visayan, Ilocano or other Philippine dialects. If the Visayan word "kanugon" would be used equally with the Tagalog word "sayang", then "kanugon" should appear in our dictionaries as a synonym of "sayang".

Some people think that only this popular, democratic level need be considered in the development of a national language. They should bear in mind that language growth on this level tends to be exasperatingly slow, uncontrolled, unpredictable and at times whimsical, faddish and vulgar. There may indeed be vocabulary growth but with little development. The growth usually consists of such colloquialism as "alembong", "sigasiga", "atik", "wapi", "ermat", "erpat", "yeba", "bomba", etc. Deliberate promotion of formal words or terms coming from the other dialects would require patient salesmanship rather than authoritativeness.

On the technical level, the basis of vocabulary amalgamation would be the need for precise terminology as recognized and determined by expert users of the language in the technical and scientific sectors concerned. This is where prescription and authority can be used to a certain extent, in addition to salesmanship.

Each basic technical or scientific word to be translated into Pilipino would be examined and determined by a panel of scientists and technical men who are experts in the specific disciplines, and their basic meaning, or meanings. Then, if there is no equivalent in the primary language base (Tagalog), the other major Philippine dialects would be searched for possible equivalents.

For example, there was no Tagalog word for gravity. The Lupon sa Agham noted, however, that the Ilocano word "dagsen" very nearly expressed the cognate ideas of weightiness and seriousness.

After detailed study, the Lupon adopted this word, respelled it "dagsin" to make it conform with Pilipino phonetics, and derived related terms as follows:

gravity	dagsin
gravitation	kadagsinan
gravitational	kadagsinanin
gravimetric	dagsinsukatin
gravimetry	dagsinsukatan
gravitate	dumagsin
gravitating	dumadagsin

Or take the term "power" in physics. Pilipino lay writers usually mistranslate this term as "lakas". Even in Spanish, the usual translation "fuerza" (as caballos de fuerza for horsepower) is not satisfactory since "fuerza" means "force" which, in physics, is significantly different from "power".

There being no precise equivalent in Tagalog, the Lupon took the Visayan-Bicol word "isog" which ordinarily means "lakas" also, and gave it the technical meaning "power". Horsepower is, therefore, isugkabayo in maugnaying Pilipino. The related terms are:

power	isog
powerful	maisog
horsepower	isugkabáyo
physics (energetics)	sugnayan
power factor	isuging kabuo
powerhouse	isugan

The Lupon's handling of the Ilocano word "dagsen" and the Visayan-Bicol word "isog" illustrates one of the strong points of the "maugnayin" method. If the two words were haphazardly introduced into Pilipino vocabulary with the same ordinary meanings as the corresponding Tagalog words "bigat" and "lakas", respectively, the two words in each pair would compete against each other for survival in the national language and the issue may remain in doubt for several hundred years. Eventually one or the other of the words in each pair may die out, resulting in net lexical loss. The maugnayin method, however, gave dagsen and isog technical meanings substantially different from, but still related to, their Tagalog counterparts. Thus there is reinforcement instead of competition. By being elevated to the higher level of science and technology, the survival of "dagsen" and "isog" in our national language has been assured. Later on, they will also have nationwide usage; most technical words tend to acquire popular usage in the long run.

Incidentally, our desire to amalgamate the major dialects should cause us to moderate the borrowing of basic terms from Spanish and English. Language is not an infinite assemblage of words. The letter combinations that can carry meanings are rather limited. An excess of foreign loanwords correspondingly diminishes

our opportunities to utilize words from our other dialects. What we might succeed in doing is to amalgamate our prospectively consistent (maugnayin) national language with a foreign language already shown to be inefficient as a medium of instruction in our elementary schools.

Indeed there are further additional examples of words from other Philippine dialects already adopted by the Lupon sa Agham in its 7,500-term glossary "Maugnaying Talasalitaang Pang-agham" published in 1969. The second edition of this book, which contains 10,000 maugnayin terms used in science and technology, is now under preparation. Future editions during the next ten years will bring the maugnaying Pilipino vocabulary to about 50,000 entries -- adequate for most teaching needs.

Adoption of the maugnayin method would enable us to solve two of our serious problems with one and the same blow.

The first problem is that which we have been discussing so far -- the practical amalgamation or synthesis of the major Philippine dialects into a viable national language.

The second problem, greater than the first in the long run, is the full utilization of that national language. In this modern, technological age, there are three main functions of language:

1. Communication
2. Early and systematic learning
3. Creative thinking

So far, we have been partially successful only in the first function. In international conferences, we are the most articulate and communicative people from the Far East, but we are also perhaps the least productive. We can communicate, especially with foreigners, but we have not been able to produce enough, much less create new forms and ideas. A people who can only communicate will remain mere consumers and imitators. Their country will remain at best a marketplace for imported commodities, ideas and mannerisms.

Communication is our minimum benefit from language. We would be shortchanging ourselves if we insist that communication is the only function of language. For daily living, we do not need a "maugnayin" language. In fact, verbal language itself would not be essential. People can communicate with signs, gestures and grimaces. Some animals, possessing no true language, communicate effectively enough for survival using clever and ingenious ways. But animals do not learn systematically nor do they think creatively -- hence they remain low forms of life.

Our educational system, by insisting on the use of a foreign language as medium of instruction, has consistently failed to lift our youth to the level of world knowledge and science. Our own educational experts evaluate the average Filipino as a third

grader. The maugnayin method will correct this unacceptable situation. Using maugnaying Pilipino as medium of learning, our elementary school children would be able to learn more science than their American counterparts, who are using a "dimaugnayin" medium. Perhaps they would manage to learn more than their Japanese counterparts because our alphabet is more efficient than the Japanese system of ideographs.

As soon as "maugnayin" Pilipino shall have enabled our youth to achieve early and systematic learning, we as a people can go on to creative thinking -- an area into which we have not yet ventured as evidenced by the fact that we have no original thinkers in the basic disciplines. We have no Nobel prize winners.

We have no scientists who have discovered new principles in science, no inventors who have devised substantially new machinery.

At the start of these public hearings, we were handed a questionnaire. We now give our replies:

1. Would you favor a re-examination of the Constitutional basis of our national language as enunciated in Section 3 Article 14 of the Constitution? Our answer is definitely yes. The present so-called "Constitutional mandate" on the national language is too brief and vague resulting in continuous debate and much controversy over the past 35 years.

2. Would you favor a re-examination of the implementation of the aforesaid Constitutional basis? Again, our answer is an emphatic yes, for reasons that will be explained in connection with our answer to the last question.

3. Would you favor the continuance of our present national language (Pilipino) as evolved by the Institute of National Language? Our answer is no, because the present manner of implementation is not along the maugnayin principle, and therefore, will not result in the amalgamation of the major Philippine dialects within our time. Also, the present manner of implementation is not giving us a "maugnayin" medium of instruction for our schools, thereby denying us the capability to realize the two other functions of a national language, i.e., early and systematic learning, and creative thinking.

We close this position paper by stating our recommendation starting from Pilipino as we now have it, the Philippine national language should be intensively developed, based principally on Tagalog and secondarily on the other major Philippine dialects, through the systematic application of the "maugnayin" method.

ANG "UNIVERSAL APPROACH" AT ANG WIKANG PAMBANSA NG PILIPINAS*

ERNESTO CONSTANTINO
Unibersidad ng Pilipinas

"Universal Approach" at Filipino

TINUTUKOY ng terminong "universal approach" o "paraang unibersal" ang paraang iprinopos ng mga lingguwist ng Unibersidad ng Pilipinas (UP) sa 1971 Kombensiyon Konstitusyonal (Konkon) para sa pagdebelop ng isang wikang pambansa para sa Pilipinas. Ang paraang ito ang inihaharap dito sa komperensiyang ito para madiskas at mapag-aralan ng mga taong paris ninyo na interesadong makakita o makaalam sa kahalagahan o kontribusyon nito sa solusyon sa problema ng Pilipinas tungkol sa wikang pambansa.

Paris ng alam na ng marami sa atin, ang "movement" o kilusan para sa pambansang wika sa Pilipinas ay nagkaroon na naman ng isang napakakritikal na problema. Malinaw na ipinapakita ito ng probisyon tungkol sa wikang pambansa sa bagong Konstitusyon ng Republika ng Pilipinas na inaprubahan ng Konkon noong Nobyembre 30, 1972. Ganito ang sinasabi ng probisyong ito:

> The National Assembly shall take steps towards the development and formal adoption of a common language to be known as Filipino. (Art. XV, Sec. 3, Par. (2))
>
> (Ang Nasyonal Asembli ay gagawa ng mga hakbang tungo sa pagdebelop at pormal na pag-adap ng panlahat na wikang pambansa na kikilalaning Filipino. (Art. XV, Sek. 3, Par. (2))

Base sa probisyong ito, masasabing hindi na Pilipino ang wikang pambansang ito ay pagkakasunduan pa sa darating na Nasyonal Asembli. Maaari nating ipalagay na gagawa ang Nasyonal Asembli ng batas na titiyak sa paraang gagamitin at mga hakbang na gagawin tungo sa pagdebelop at pormal na pag-adap sa bagong wikang pambansa.

Ang paraang unibersal, bilang proposal ng mga lingguwist ng UP, ay nagbibigay ng paraan na sa aming palagay ay magagamit para matagumpay at mabilis na madebelop ang bagong wikang pambansa. Gaya ng aming prediksiyon, ang paraang ito ay masiglang tinatanggap ng marami at mahigpit namang tinututulan ng iba. Katunayan, ito'y naging kontrobersiyal, kung minsa'y proberbiyal, lalo na sa mga hindi pa nakakaalam kung ano ito.

Layunin ng papel na ito na ipaliwanag ang ilang misteryo ng paraang ito. Pagkaraan ng mahigit na isang taon mula nang iharap ito sa Konkon, ipinasiya namin na ipaliwanag dito sa komperensiyang ito ang mga pangunahing karakteristik ng paraang ito. Alam namin na isang malaking obligasyon para sa amin na iharap ang paraang ito sa publiko, lalo na sa komperensiyang ito ng mga eksperto sa wika mula sa iba't ibang bansa sa Asia, mga lingguwist, mga titser sa wika at iba pang iskolar sa wika, dahil sa pangyayaring ang paraang ito ang inindors o sadyang pinili ng Komite ng Wikang Pambansa ng Konkon na gagamitin sa pagdebelop sa bagong wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas.

Ang paggamit ng paraang unibersal sa pagdebelop sa wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas ay pormal na iprinopos ni Dr. Cecilio Lopez, Emeritus na Propesor ng Lingguwistiks at Oriental Studies sa UP, sa pinakahuling public hearing ng nasabing komite sa Manila Hotel na ginanap noong Disyembre 22, 1976. Sa hiring na iyon, sinabi ni Dr. Lopez na ang paggamit ng "language universals approach" ay maaaring siyang solusyon sa problema ng Pilipinas sa wikang pamansa na nagbibigay hanggang ngayon ng malaking gulo sa Tagalog lang. Agad tinanggap ng karamihan o halos lahat ng mga miyembro ng komiteng present sa hiring any proposal ni Dr. Lopez, at tinawag itong "universal approach" imbis na "language universals approach." Naging popular, sa mabuti o masama, ang paraang ito sa maikli nitong pangalan.

May dalawang dahilan kung bakit ipinasiya ng mga lingguwist ng UP na ipropos ang paggamit ng paraang unibersal sa pagdebelop sa bagong wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas. Ang unang dahilan ay may kinalaman sa nakikitang patuloy na problema ng wikang Pilipino na tanggapin o kilalanin ng mga Pilipino, lalo na ng mga di-Tagalog, bilang wikang pambansa nila. Naniniwala kami na ito'y hindi magiging problema ng wikang pambansang madedebelop sa pamamagitan ng paraang unibersal, at ito'y magiging malinaw sa bandang huli ng papel na ito. Ang ikalawang dahilan ay bunga ng matatag at di-matinag na determinasyon ng karamihan sa mga miyembro ng Komite sa Wikang Pambansa ng Konkon at ng buong Konkon mismo (na magiging miyembro ng interim na Nasyonal Asembli) na pigilin ang paggamit sa wikang Pilipino bilang wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas at palitan ito ng isang wikang batay sa ilan o sa maraming wika ng Pilipinas. Kami sa UP ay naniniwala na kapag nasunod ang gusto ng mga delegado sa Konkon, ang paggamit sa paraang unibersal ay sisiguro sa mabilis na pagdebelop at pag-adap sa bagong wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas. Kayat makikita dito na di paris ng impresyon ng iba, ang aming pangunahing layunin sa pagpopropos sa paraang unibersal sa pagdebelop ng wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas ay hindi para pigilin ang paggamit sa Pilipino bilang wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas kundi para masiguro na

kung sakaling hindi tatanggapin ang Pilipino, maaaring dumebelop sa loob ng pinakamaikling panahon ng isang wikang aktuwal at natural na gagamitin at hindi isang wikang mananatiling simboliko lamang at laging naghihingalo dahil hindi natural na ginagamit.

Ang Pilipino sa U.P.

Siguro'y dapat kong gamitin ang pagkakataong ito para linawin na ang mga lingguwist ng UP ay hindi kailanman kontra o galit sa wikang Pilipino bilang isa sa mga ginagamit na wika sa Pilipinas o bilang wikang pambansa. Ang totoo, ginagawa namin sa UP ang lahat ng aming magagawa nang mas masigasig kaysa alinmang institusyon sa buong bansa para paunlarin ang pag-aaral, paggamit at pagtanggap sa Pilipino hindi bilang wikang pambansa lang kundi bilang pangunahing medium din sa pagtuturo sa lahat ng eskuwelahan, sa lahat ng grado at sa lahat ng kurso dito sa Pilipinas. Sa kasalukuyan, nagbibigay ang UP ng Bachelor of Arts degree at Master of Arts degree sa Pilipino; hindi matatagalan, magbibigay na rin ang UP ng Doctor of Philosophy degree sa Pilipino. Maraming mahahalagang reserts (research) tungkol sa Pilipino ang nagawa na at ginagawsa sa UP. Kahit ang gramar ng kasalukuyang wikang pambansa ay sinusulat ngayon sa UP ng mga reserts assistant na sinusuwelduhan ng Surian ng Wikang Pambansa sa ilalim ng superbisyon ng isang miyembro ng faculty ng UP. Isang monolingguwal at isang bilingguwal na diksyunaryo ang ginagawa sa UP. Mayroon ding inihahandang manwal at babasahin sa Pilipino sa UP. Ang totoo, ang posisyon ng Pilipino sa UP ngayon ay kapantay na ng Ingles bilang isang disiplina o larangan ng pag-aaral at bilang medium sa pagtuturo. Nasisiguro naming hindi pa nangyayari ito sa mga ibang eskuwelahan.

Oposisyon sa Pilipino

Sa isang multilingguwal at naging kolonyang bansa na paris ng Pilipinas na dayuhang wika ang dominanteng wika kahit na mayroon ditong ilang establisadong katutubong wika na bawat isa'y may maraming ispiker kayat posibleng kandidato sa posisyon ng wikang pambansa, maaaring mangyari na ang paggamit o pagpili sa alinman sa mga katutubong wika bilang wikang pambansa o batayan nito ay lumikha ng malakas na oposisyon sa mga ispiker o supporter ng ibang wika, pati na ng dayu hang wika. Nangyari ito sa Pilipinas. Ang pagpili sa Tagalog bilang batayan ng wikang pambansa ay lumikha ng malakas at patuloy na oposisyon mula sa mga di-Tagalog at sa mga pro-Ingles. Madalas naipapahiwatig ang oposisyong ito sa mga sulat sa mga editor ng mga peryodikal at sa mga paulit-ulit na habla at salita laban sa Pilipino. Ang pagtawag ng Konkon noong 1971 ang nagbigay ng pinakahihintay na pagkakataon sa mga di-Tagalog at sa mga pro-Ingles na baguhin o patayin ang wikang pambansang batay sa isang wika.

Sa mga una pa lamang sesyon ng Konkon malinaw nang lumabas ang malakas na pagkontra o pagtanggi ng karamihan sa mga delegado sa Konkon (na mga di-Tagalog) sa patuloy na paggamit sa Pilipino bilang wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas. Ang palagay namin sa UP ay milagro na lamang ang makapipigil sa pagkontrang iyon. Kayat sa amin sa UP, ang problema ay hindi na kung paano mapapanatili ang wikang Pilipino bilang wikang pambansa kundi ito: Paano magpapatuloy na may wikang pambansa ang Pilipinas na mula sa sariling wika o mga wika nito? Sa madaling sabi, nang ipropos namin ang paraang unibersal, ang nangunguna naming layunin ay siguruhin na ang Pilipinas ay patuloy na magkakaroon ng wikang pambansa na tubo o tunay na sa bansang ito, kahit na ang wikang ito'y hindi ang wikang Pilipino. Ang totoo, natatakot kami na kung hindi epektibong masagot ang opinyong ipinipilit ng isang patnugot at ng presidente ng isang samahan sa lingguwistiks at ng mga kakampi nila na hindi maaaring bumuo ng isang wikang pambansang batay sa higit sa isang wika at dito sa Pilipinas ang wikang Tagalog lang ang puwedeng batayan ng wikang pambansa, ang wikang Ingles ang tuluyang magsilbing wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas. Ganitong opinyon ang gusto ng mga pro-Pilipino (at ganoon din ng ilang pro-Ingles na tumutulong sa kanila) na paniwalaan ng mga delegado sa Konkon para huwag na nilang baguhin ang status quo.

Pero gusto ng Komite sa Wikang Pambansa ng Konkon na dumebelop ng isang bagong wikang pambansa na tatawaging Filipino "batay sa mga umiiral na katutubong wika at dayalek ng Pilipinas na hindi ipinupuwera ang asimilasyon ng mga salita mula sa mga banyagang wika." Ang layuning ito ng komite ay ipinasok bilang Seksiyon 2 ng draft resolution na inaprubahan ng komite. Inihayag din ng komite sa mga komentaryo sa sekisyong ito ang akademikong opinyon ng mga lingguwist ng UP na puwedeng bumuo ng isang wikang pambansang batay sa higit sa isang wika at tiniyak dito ang paggamit sa "universal approach" o paraang unibersal ng mga lingguwist na ito sa pagdebelop sa bagong wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas. Dito tuluyang lumalim ang pagkasangkot ng mga lingguwist ng UP sa peligroso at delikadong trabaho tungkol sa pagdebelop ng wikang pambansa para sa Pilipinas.

Paraan ng Pagdebelop sa Wikang Pambansa

Ang paraang unibersal ayon sa pormulasyon nito sa UP ay naglalayong dumebelop ng isang wikang pambansa para sa Pilipinas batay hindi sa isang wika lang kundi sa maraming wika. Layunin ng paraang ito na debelopin ang wikang pambansang ito sa pamamagitan ng paggamit unang-una sa mga pangkalahatan o unibersal na mga pangunahing layunin at resulta ng mga reserts namin sa UP tungkol sa pang-ilalim ("deep") at pang-ibabaw ("surface") na pagkakapareho at pagkakaiba ng mga wika at dayalek sa Pilipinas. Ipinapakita ng mga resulta ng mga reserts na ito sa nakakakumbinsing paraan na maaaring dumebelop ng isang wika sa pagsasama-sama sa base o buod nito ng mga magkakapareho o unibersal na sangkap at anyo ng mga wika at dayalek ng Pilipinas. Tingnan Constantino (1970).

Ilan sa mga nagpalakas ng loob naming mga lingguwist sa UP para ipropos ang paraang unibersal ay ang mga bagong debelopment sa lingguwistiks, sa edukasyon at sa mas media na lalong nagpapalaki sa posibilidad ng paggamit hindi ng isang wika lang kundi ng isang grupo ng mga wika bilang batayan ng isang wikang pambansa kung matutugunan nito ang paghahangad ng mga mamamayan para sa pambansang identidad o integrasyon. Nagpalakas din ng loob namin ang obserbasyon ng isang iskolar na may malawak na kaalaman tungkol sa mga wikang pambansa na kung punto ng lingguwistiks ang kokonsiderahin, ang paglikha ng isang wikang pambansa na batay sa isang wika o sa ilang wika o ang pagtanggap ng isang bagong wikang pambansa ay magpapatuloy nang walang limit hanggat epektibo ang mga pang-ikonomikong posibilidad at ang mga pulitikal o nasyonalistikong paghahangad dito (Deutsch 1962:605). Sumasangayon din kami sa sinabi ng iskolar na ito na mapapalitan anumang oras ng mga mamamayan ang kanilang wikang pambansa para bagayan o sundin ang kanilang nasyonalistikong hangaring mapaiba o magkaisa (p.604).

Alam na alam ng mga tagapagplano ng wika na may dalawang paraang puwedeng gamitin sa pagdebelop ng isang wikang pambansa. Ang unang paraan ay ang paggamit ng isang wika, at ang ikalawang paraan ay ang pagsasama-sama ng mga sangkap at anyo mula sa dalawa o higit pang wika. Ang unang paraan ang ginamit sa pagdebelop sa Pilipino; nabuo ang wika pero lumilitaw ngayon na hindi ito tinatanggap ng maraming Pilipino bilang wikang pambansa nila. Ang totoo, hindi humihinto ang malakas na oposisyon sa Pilipino bilang wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas. Dahil dito, naisip namin sa UP na dapat nang gamitin ang ikalawang paraan sapagkat naniniwala kami na ang wikang madedebelop sa paraang ito ay tatanggapin at gagamitin ng mga Pilipino bilang wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas. Kayat iprinopos namin sa Konkon nang malaunan ang aming paraang unibersal para sa pagdebelop sa bagong wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas. Ikinatutuwa at ikinararangal namin ang pagtanggap agad ng Konkon sa responsibilidad at malaking trabaho sa amin. Isa sa aming responsibilidad na nais kong gawin ngayon ay ang pagpapaliwanag sa mga intersadong paris ninyo ng kung ano ang "universal approach" o paraang unibersal at kung paano ito magagamit sa pagdebelop sa bagong wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas na paris ng hinihingi ng bagong Konstitusyon.

Prinsipyo at Metod ng Paraang Unibersal

Tatlong magkakaugnay na prinsipyo ang sinusunod ng paraang unibersal.

1. Ang unang prinsipyo ay nagsasabi na ang wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas ay dapat ibatay hindi sa isang wika lang kundi sa maraming wika ng Pilipinas; pero hindi nito ipinupuwera na isa sa mga wikang ito ang gawing nukleus o simula ng wikang pambansa. Sa madaling sabi, sa pagdebelop sa wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas batay sa prinsipyong ito, maaaring mag-umpisa sa ilang wika nang sabay-sabay at maaari ring mag-umpisa sa isang wika lang.

2. Ang ikalawang prinsipyo ay nagsasabi na sa pagpili ng mga sangkap o anyo na isasama sa wikang pambans (halimbawa, mga tunog, salita, panlapi, konstruksiyon, atbp.), dapat bigyan ng preperensiya ang mga sangkap o anyong ginagamit ng mas maraming wika. Halimbawa, kung ang x at y ay dalawang salitang ginagamit sa mga wika ng Pilipinas na may parehong kahulugan (pero magkaiba sa anyo) at ang x ay ginapamit sa 50ng wika samantalang ang y ay ginagamit sa 30, dapat bigyan ng preperesiya ang x sa pagbuo sa bokabularyo ng wikang pambansa.

3. Ang ikatlong prinsipyo ay nagsasabi na ang wikang pambansa ay papayagang gumamit, lalo na sa umpisa, ng mga grupo ng salitang magkakapareho ang kahulugan (mga sinomin) at hanggat maaari, hindi sosobra sa apat ang miyembro ng bawat grupo.

4. Ang ikatlong prinsipyo ay nagsasabi na ang wikang pambansa ay papayagang gumamit, lalo na sa umpisa, ng mga grupo ng salitang magkakapareho ang kahulugan (mga sinomin) at hanggat maaari, hindi sosobra sa apat ang miyembro ng bawat grupo.

Sa paraang unibersal, dalawang metod ang maaaring gamitin sa pagbuo ng wikang pambansa: Metod A at B. Nag-uumpisa ang Metod A sa ilang wika nang sabay-sabay sa pagbuo ng wikang pambansa; ang Metod B ay nag-uumpisa sa isang wika lang. Ganito ang paraang sinusunod ng dalawang metod na ito sa pagbuo ng wikang pambansa:

1. Bilang unang hakbang, mag-aadap ng unibersal na alpabet para sa wikang pambansa na paris ng bagong alpabet na inadap ng Surian ng Wikang Pambansa. Sa ngayon, gagamitin ang alpabet na ito pati na ang mga tuntunin sa pagbabaybay o ispeling para madaling mabasa at matanggap ng mga Pilipino ang baybay o ispeling ng mga salita sa wikang pambansa. (Ang bagong alpabet at ang mga tuntunin sa pagbabaybay ay kasama bilang Apendiks "B" sa librong ito.)

2. Ang ikalawang hakbang ay ang pagsulat ng isang unibersal na gramar ng mga wika ng Pilipinas. Para maisulat ang gramar na ito, kailangang malaman o mailista nang maayos ang pang-ilalim at pang-ibabaw na gramar ng mga wika at dayalek ng Pilipinas. Hindi na ito mahirap gawin ngayon. Sa ngayon, nakolekta na namin sa UP ang karamihan sa mga kailangang datos sa mahigit na 400ng wika at dayalek ng Pilipinas. Kung mabibigyan kami ng kailangang pondo, tauhan at kagamitan, ang unibersal na gramar na ito ay matatapos sa loob ng dalawang taon.

3. Ang ikatlong hakbang ay gagawin pagkatapos maisulat ang unibersal na gramar. Kung gagamitin ang Metod A, gagawa ng unibersal na diksyunaryo o tesaurus ng mga wika at daylek ng Pilipinas. Ang diksyunaryong ito'y bubuuin sa umpisa ng lahat ng mga salitang nakolekta sa mga wika at dayalek ng Pilipinas;

pagsasama-samahin ang mga sinonim sa isang entri sa ayos na ipapaliwanag sa sumusunod na hakbang. Kayat sa umpisa, halos lahat ng mga salita sa unibersal na diksyunaryo ay may sinonim at karamihan sa mga grupo ng sinonim ay may sobra sa limang miyembro. Ang pagbabawas ng miyembro sa bawat grupo ng mga sinonim ay ipapaliwanag sa sumusunod na hakbang. Sa ngayon, nakakolekta na kami sa UP ng hindi kukulangin sa 5,000ng salita na binubuo ng mga istem ("stem"), salitang-ugat("root-word") at partikel ("particle") mula sa hindi kukulangin sa 300ng wika at dayalek ng Pilipinas. Ang mga salitang ito ay ipapasok sa unibersal na diksyunaryo habang ipinagpapatuloy ang pagkolekta ng mga karagdagang datos sa iba't ibang wika at dayalek ng Pilipinas. Kung mabibigyan ng kailangang pondo, tauhan at kagamitan, gaya ng gramar ay matatapos ang diksyunaryong ito sa loob ng dalawang taon.

Kung gagamitin ang Metod B, ang mga salita sa wikang pinili bilang simula o nukleus ng wikang pambansa ang bubuo sa inisyal na diksyunaryo ng wikang pambansa. Para maging unibersal na diksyunaryo ang diksyunaryong ito, payayamanin o daragdangan ito sa susunod na limang taon ng mga salitang mula sa ibang wika at dayalek, katutubo at banyaga, at laging gagamitin ang mga tuntunin sa sumusunod na hakbang.

4. Ang ikaapat na hakbang. Pagkatapos magawa ang unibersal na diksyunaryo, o kahit na habang ginagawa pa ito, susundin ang mga sumsunod na tuntunin para sa istandardisasyon ng diksyunaryo (a) Aalisin sa diksyunaryo ang lahat ng mga sinonim na ginagamit sa kulang sa ½ to 1/3 ng mga wika at dayalek na kasama sa pagbuo ng diksyunaryo, puwera ang mga sinonim, na ginagamit sa isang malaking wikang rehiyonal, paris ng Tagalog, Cebuano, Ilokano o Tausug. Puwede ring sundin ang tuntuning ito para sa isang grupo ng sinonim na may dalawang miyembro lang. (b) Hanggat maaari, hindi dapat sumobra sa apat ang miyembro ng isang grupo ng sinonim. (c) Hindi dapat magkaroon ng mga sinonim ang mga salitang madalas na gamitin, paris ng mga artikulo at iba pang pananda ng gramatikal na relasyon.

Sa isang grupo ng mga sinonim sa unibersal na diksyunaryo, bibigyan ng preperensiya ang miyembro na ginagamit sa mas maraming wika o sa simulang wika. Ang salita lang na binibigyan ng preperensiya ang bibigyan ng depinisyon at bawat isa sa mga sinonim nito ay kikilalanin lang na sinonim ng salitang ito.

Bibigkasin ang mga salita sa unibersal na diskyunaryo sa paraang binibigkas ang mga ito sa mga wikang pinagmulan. Sa isang grupo ng mga sinomin na nagkakaiba nang kaunti sa ispeling (kahit na pareho sa bigkas), isa sa mga ispeling ang bibigyan ng preperensiya at ang ibang ispeling ay kokonsiderahing baryant ng ispeling na ito. Ang ispeling na bibigyan ng preperensiya ay iyong ispeling na ginagamit sa mas maraming wika o kaya'y iyong ispeling na sumusunod sa mga tuntunin sa ispeling na kasama ng unibersal na alpabet.

Ang gramar at diksyunaryo ay dapat rebisahin o rebaysin pagkatapos ng hindi sosobra sa sampung taon para isunod sa mga debelopment sa wika at para payamanin o lalong pahusayin.

Maaari ring gumamit ng ikatlong metod sa pagbuo ng wikang pambansa na lumalagay sa pagitan ng Metod A at B; tatawagin natin itong Metod C. Sa Metod C, maaaring gumamit ng dalawa hanggang walong wika bilang base ng wikang pambansa. Ang mga salita sa mga ibang wika ay idaragdag sa diksyunaryo nito sa loob ng limang taon.

Karakteristik ng Bagong Wikang Pambansa

Narito ang ilan sa mga karakteristik ng wikang mabubuo sa pamamagitan ng alinman sa tatlong metod ng paraang unibersal:

1. Una, ang wikang mabubuo sa paraang unibersal ay tiyak na isang wika ng Pilipinas. Kaparehong-kapareho nito ang mga wika ng Pilipinas sa tunog, bokabularyo at gramar. Ang pang-ilalim na balangkas nito'y kapareho ng pang-ilalim na balangkas ng mga wika at dayalek ng Pilipinas. Maiiba lang ito sa mga ibang wika ng Pilipinas sa pangibabaw na balangkas.

2. Ikalawa, ang wikang mabubuo ay hindi magkakaroon ng anumang sangkap o anyo na wala sa mga wika ng Pilipinas. Pero may mga (pang-ibabaw na) sangkap at anyo ng isang partikular na wika na posibleng wala sa wikang ito.

3. Ikatlo, paris ng alinmang wika, ang wikang bubuuin sa paraang unibersal ay magkakaroon ng sariling buhay sa oras na ito'y gamitin. Hindi ito magiging isang artipisyal o patay na wika.

4. Ikaapat, kung susundin ang Metod A o Metod C, maaaring sa simula'y walang katutubong ispiker ang wikang mabubuo, at dahil dito masasabing artipisyal na wika ito. Pero kung susunin ang Metod B, ang wikang mabubuo ay isang natural na wika na aktuwal na sinasalita na ngayon ng maraming Pilipino. lalo na kung ang basehang wika ay ang tinatawag naming Pilipino ng UP. Ito ang Pilipinong ginagamit hindi lang sa katagalugan at kamaynilaan kundi pati sa mga rehiyon na ang katutubo o dominanteng wika ay hindi Tagalog.

5. At ikalima, mapapansin sa nakaraang diskasyon na walang salita o anumang sangkap na iimbentuhin para isama sa bubuuing wikang pambansa. Ang pag-iimbento ng mga salita at iba pang sangkap ng wika ay hindi kailangan sa paraang unibersal. Hindi rin kailangang gamitin o buhayin pa rito ang mga patay nang salita o iyong mga salitang ginagamit noong unang panahon na hindi na ginagamit o naiintindihan ngayon. Lahat ng mga tunog, salita, konstruksiyon at iba pang bagay sa wikang pambansa na dedebelopin sa paraang unibersal ay buhay at natural sapagkat kasalukuyang ginagamit ang mga ito sa mga wika at dayalek ng Pilipinas na sinasalita ngayon ng mga Pilipino.

Pagdebelop sa Wikang Pambansa sa U.P.

Makikita sa katatapos na diskasyon na ang aktuwal na pagdebelop ng isang wikang pambansa sa pamamagitan ng alinman sa tatlong metod ng paraang unibersal ay hindi mahirap o imposible. Sa katunayan, kung mayroon lang mga kailangang pondo, tauhan at kagamitan, madedebelop ang wikang ito sa loob ng dalawang taon. Ang madedebelop na wika ay masasalita, maisusulat at mababasa ng sinumang Pilipinong nakakapagsalita, nakakasulat at nakakabasa ng kahit anong wika. Maituturo ito at magpag-aaralan paris ng anumang wika at nang mas madali kaysa Ingles, Kastila o anumang banyagang wika. Sa madaling sabi, paris ng alinmang buhay na wika, magagamit ito sa pagkokomunika mula sa henerasyon ito hanggang sa mga darating pang henerasyon. At ipinipredik namin na ang wikang ito ay mas tatanggapin ng mga Pilipino bilang wikang pambansa nila sapagkat hindi lang ito nagmumula sa kanilang iba't ibang wika at dayalek kundi ito'y konkreto at buhay na simbolo rin ng kanilang pagkakapare-pareho at pagkakaisa at ng kanilang matagal nang pinakahahanap na pambansang identidad o nasyonal aydentiti.

May mga magtatanong siguro kung alin sa tatlong metod ng paraang unibersal na katatapos na diskasin ang pinipili o pinapaboran ng UP. Pinipili namin sa Departamento ng Pilipino at Literatura ng Pilipinas (ngagoy'y Departamento ng Filipino at mga Wika na Pilipinas) ng UP ang Metod B. Ngayon pa'y inuumpisahan na namin ang gapdebelop sa UP ng wikang pambansa simula sa isang wika. Ang simulang wika ay hindi ang wikang Tagalog kundi ang tinatawag naming Pilipino ng UP. Iba ang Pilipino ng UP sa Pilipinong pinalalaganap at gustong palaganapin ng Surian ng Wikang Pambansa at itinuturo sa mga public school sa Pilipinas. Ang Pilipino ng UP ay ang uri ng Pilipino na ginagamit sa buong bansa, hindi lamang ng mga Tagalog o sa mga lugar na Tagalog ang katutubo o dominanteng wika kundi pati ng mga di-Tagalog o sa mga lugar na mga ibang wika ang katutubo o dominante.

Para makita ang aktuwal na anyo at gamit at halimbawa ng Pilipino ng UP, iniisip at hinarap namin agad ang magsalin sa wikang ito ng mga obrang nakasulat sa ibang wika, lalo na ng mga obra sa iba't ibang literatura ng Pilipinas. Nakita namin na ang katipunan ng mga obra sa iba't ibang wika ng Pilipinas na naisalin at maisasalin sa wikang pambansang aming dinedebelop ay maaari at dapat na maging simula ng pambansang literatura ng Pilipinas sa ganitong paraan ay aming ihaharap sa ibang papel. Masasabi lang namin dito na naniniwala kami (at ganoon din ang ibang nakarinig sa proposal naming ito) na ang pagdebelop ng wikang pambansa at ng pambansang literatura ng Pilipinas ay mas mabuti at mas madaling magawa kung mapagsasabay batay sa mga prinsipyo ng paraang unibersal. Masasabi rin namin dito nang walang pag-aalinlangan na ang wikang pambansang madedebelop sa paraang unibersal ay siyang pinakamabisa at pinakaangkop na wika ng pambansang literatura ng Pilipinas, hindi ang wikang Ingles o Tagalog at hindi rin ang puro o puristang Pilipino.

Argumento para sa Pilipino

Ngayon, tingnan naman natin ang mga pangunahing argumentong ginagamit bilang suporta sa palagay na ang wikang Pilipino ang nasa pinakamabuting posisyon para maging wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas. Ang mga argumentong ito ay ang sumusunod: (a) Pilipino ang wika ng Maynila, ang pinakaimportanteng siyudad sa buong Pilipinas, kayat mas prestijus ("prestigious") ito kaysa mga ibang wika ng Pilipinas; (b) Pilipino ang dominanteng wika sa mas media; (c) Mas marami ang ispiker ng Pilipino kaysa alinman sa mga ibang wika ng Pilipinas; (d) Batay ang Pilipino sa pinakadebelop na wika ng Pilipinas at hindi magtatagal at aktuwal nang sasalitain ito ng lahat ng mga Pilipino.

Nakikita namin ngayon na ang mga argumentong ito na matagal nang inuulit-ulit ng mga pro-Pilipino ay hindi naging sapat para magtagumpay ang Pilipino bilang wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas. Sa kabilang dako, ang mga argumentong ito mismo at ang "puristang" palisi (policy) na sinunod sa pagdebelop, pagpapaunlad at pagtuturo sa Pilipino ang mga aktuwal na dahilan ng pagkabigo ng Pilipino bilang wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas. Pero ito'y hindi na saklaw ng papel na ito. Masasabi lang dito na marami sa mga sumusuporta sa Pilipino ang nagtaka nang atakihin nang matindi at pagkatapos ay tuluyang itakwil ng Konkon ang Pilipino biling wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas. Hindi nila nakita na ang pagkalat ng Pilipino sa buong bansa at ang pagtuturo ng puristang anyo nito sa lahat ng eskuwelahan ay ilan sa mga nagpalakas sa etnikong kamalayan ng mga grupo sa Pilipinas at ang kamalayang ito sa parte ng mga di-Tagalog na grupo ay tumanggi sa Pilipino (na ipinalagay nilang Tagalog) bilang wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas.

Kritisisim sa Paraang Unibersal

Balikan natin ang paraang unibersal. Mula nang banggitin ito sa Konkon, tumanggap ito ng maraming kritisism o puna, kahit noong hindi pa natitiyak ng mga kritik kung ano ito. Dalawa ang pinakamadalas na kritisisim. Una, may mga kritik na nagasasabi na imposible raw, hindi matino, o kaya'y "kaululang lingguwistik" (Nakpil 1972) ang bumuo ng isang wikang batay sa higit sa isang wika o batay sa maraming wika. Ito ang sinabi ng isang kritik ng paraang unibersal (Roces 1972):

> But to expect that 87 separate branches make a language tree is absurd because there have to be roots and a trunk where diverse branches can be grafted.
>
> (Ngunit isang kalokohan na asahang 87ng magkakahiwalay na sanga ang bubuo sa isang language tree sapagkat kailangang magkaroon ito ng mga ugat at katawan na pagpapatubuan ng magkakaibang sanga.)

Ikalawa, kahit na raw makabuo ng wika sa paraang unibersal, imposibleng mapakalat ito sapagkat ito'y isang artipisyal na wika at dahil dito hindi ito pag-aaralan o matututuhan ng mga Pilipino. Ito naman ang sinabi ng isa pang kritik (Nakpil 1972):

> One of the most irrefutable principles of linguistics is that a language that is nobody's mother tongue will be extremely difficult to teach or learn and almost impossible to implant. One can propagate, or enrich with loan words, an existing language, but one cannot invent one out of thin blue air, or even out of 8 "mutally unintelligible" rival languages, without courting muteness. An artificail language with no native speakers - as Esperanto, Orbis, Frate, Universalia, Parla all in their own good time have shown - just won't take. To impose one on Filipinos now is to court muteness, total illiteracy and ineradicable ignorance.
>
> (Isa sa mga di-makokontrang prinsipyo ng lingguwistiks ay ito: Ang wika na hindi inang wika ng sinuman ay totoong napakahirap iturò at pag-aralan at halos imposibleng itanim sa isip. Puwedeng palaganapin, o payamanin sa mga hiram na salita, ang isang umiiral na wika ngunit hindi puwedeng umimbento ng isang wika mula sa manipis na hanging asul ("thin blue air") o kahit sa walong "di-nagkakaintindihang" magkakaribal na wika nang hindi tutungo sa pagkapipi. Ang isang wikang artipisyal na walang katutubong ispiker - gaya ng ipinakita ng Esperanto, Orbis, Frate, Universalia, Parla sa kani-kanilang panahon - ay talagang di pupuwede. Ang ipilit ang isang wikang ganito sa mga Pilipino ngayon ay patungo sa pagkapipi, total na iliterasi at di maalis na ignoransiya.)

Naipaliwanag na namin na hindi imposibleng bumuo ng isang wika batay sa ilang wika. Ginagawa ito ngayon sa Norway (Haugen 1968). Nagawa na ito sa Southern Rhodesia at sa Macedonia (Lunt 1959). Hindi ko maintindihan kung bakit hindi ito pupuwede sa Pilipinas lalo na kung iisipin na ang mga wika at dayalek sa bansang ito ay magkakapareho sa isa't isa sa tunog, bokabularyo at gramar.

Nasabi na rin na maaring ang wikang madedebelop batay sa paraang unibersal ay artipisyal - nangangahulugang hindi ito inang wika ng sinuman sa umpisa, pero maaari ring ang wikang mabubuo sa pamamagitan ng paraang unibersal ay natural - nangangahulugang may mga nagsasalita nito sa simula pa. Ito'y depende sa metod na gagamitin sa pagbuo sa wika. Ngayon, tungkol naman sa pagiging artipisyal ng isang wika, gusto kong basahin sa inyo ang sumusunod na obserbasyon (Pei 1967:ix):

> The charge of "artificiality" often leveled at constructed (or artificial) languages...is no charge at all. A horse is "natural," an automobile is "artificial." For purposes of present-day travel under present-day conditions, no one seriously questions the superiority of an "artificial" automobile.

(Ang bintang na "pagiging artipisyal" na karaniwang iniuukol sa binalangkas (o artipisyal) na mga wika...ay di tunay na bintang. Ang kabayo ay "natural," ang automobil ay "artipisyal." Sa mga pagbibiyahe ngayon sa kasalukuyang kondisyon, walang sinumang seryosong kukuwestiyon sa superyoridad ng isang "artipisyal" na automobil.)

Tagumpay ng Wikang Pambansa

Sa pinal na analisis, ang tagumpay ng isang wika na maging wikang pambansa ng isang bansa ay depende hindi sa pagiging artipisyal o natural nito kundi sa pagtanggap o atityud (attitude) ng mga taong pinag-uukulan nito o dapat na gumamit nito. Kami sa UP ay matatag na naniniwala na ang wikang madedebelop sa pamamagitan ng paraang unibersal ay mas madaling tanggapin at gamitin kaysa sa wikang Pilipino, lalo na iyong Pilipinong itinuturo ngayon sa mga public school, bilang wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas. Ang paniwala naming ito ay batay sa mga sumusunod na dahilan: (1) Ang wikang mabubuo sa pamamagitan ng paraang unibersal ay hindi batay sa Tagalog lang o sa isang wikang inaari o inaangkin ng isang malaking etnikong grupo; (2) Ang wikang ito ay base sa marami kundi man sa lahat ng mga wika at dayalek ng Pilipinas; (3) Hindi papaboran ng wikang ito ang alinman sa mga etnikong grupo ng Pilipinas; (4) Ang pagbuo at pagpapayaman sa wikang ito ay magiging responsibilidad ng lahat ng mga etnikong grupo sa Pilipinas, hindi ng isang grupo lang.

Sa kabuuan, nakikita namin na ang paggamit ng paraang unibersal sa pagdebelop sa pambansang wika ng Pilipinas ay magbubunga ng malaking epekto o pagbabago sa atitynud ng mga Pilipino, hindi lang sa kanilang wikang pambansa kundi pati na sa kanilang kultura at literatura at sa kanilang bayan at kapwa Pilipino. Sa paggamit nila ng wikang pambansang dinebelop sa paraang unibersal, na binubuo ng mga sangkap at anyong nagmumula sa iba't ibang wika at dayalek ng Pilipinas, malalapit sila sa iba't ibang kultura, literatura, tao at rehiyon ng Pilipinas. Lalaki ang kaalaman at interes nila sa mga ito at ang atityud nila sa mga ito ay magiging masigla at positibo, imbis na laging malamig o paiwas at negatibo. Sa paggamit nila ng wikang pambansang dinebelop sa paraang unibersal, makikita nila na ang wikang ito'y mula at para sa lahat ng Pilipino, at ito'y nagbibigay ng pabor sa lahat ng Pilipino, hindi sa mga miyembro ng isang etnikong grupo lang. Makikita rin nila na ang wikang ito'y mas madaling matutuhan at mas epektibong magagamit ng mga Pilipino kaysa wikang Ingles, at ang wikang ito at hindi ang wikang Ingles o anumang dayuhang wika ang tunay na tatak at daluyan ng pambansang kultura at identidad ng mga Pilipino. Kayat naniniwala kami na hindi na kailangang maghintay pa ang mga Pilipino ng 100 o 50 o kahit na 25ng taon para makita nila na ang kanilang wikang pambansa ay siyang wika ng kanilang pagkakaisa at pagkakaiba, ang wika ng kanilang identidad, at ang wikang magpapalaya sa kanila sa mga banyaga at alyenadong isipan at oryentasyon.

BIBLIOGRAPI

Constantino, Ernesto. 1970. "The deep structures of Philippine languages." The archive 1(2):65-79.

_____. 1970-1971. "Ang hinaharap ng Pilipino." General Education Journal no. 19-10:1-3.

_____ at Rogelio Sikat. 1974. "Ang pagbuo ng pambansang literatura ng Pilipinas." Literatura ng Pilipinas 1(1):1-25.

Deutsch, Karl W. 1968. "The trend of European nationalism - the language aspect." Nasa Fishman 1968, pp. 598-606.

Fishman, Joshua A., ed. 1968. Readings in the sociology of language. The Hague: Mouton.

Haugen, Einar. 1968. "Language planning in Norway." Nasa Fishman 1968, pp. 673-687.

LITERATURA ng Pilipinas; Jornal para sa mga Literatura ng Pilipinas. Bolyum I, Numero 1, Enero 1974. Publikasyon ng Samahan para sa mga Literatura ng Pilipinas (SALIPI), Unibersidad ng Pilipinas, Diliman, Quezon City.

Lunt, Horace G. 1959. "The creation of standard Macedonian: Some facts and attitude." Anthropological Linguistics 1(5):19-26.

Nakpil, Carmen Guerrero. 1972. "Happy but mute." The Manila Chronicle, April 7, 1972, p. 4.

Pei, Mario, 1968. "Foreword." Nasa Esperanto: A complete grammar, ni Ivy Kellerman Reed, pp. vii-x. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press.

Roces, Alfredo. 1972. "Light and shadow: Legislated languages." The Manila Times, April 18, 1972, p. 5.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

FILIPINO COMPONENT

WORKSHOP: What is Pilipino?

Saturday, November 15, 1975

10:00 A.M. - 3:00 P.M.

2168 Shattuck Ave., 3rd Floor

Berkeley, California 94704

(415) 848-3199

SUMMARY OF THE "WHAT IS PILIPINO?" WORKSHOP

A workshop on "What is Pilipino?", the first of its kind to focus on this problem, was held at the Asian American Bilingual Center in Berkeley, California on November 15, 1975. Thirty participants attended the workshop. They were educators, parents and other community members from the Bay Area, Stockton, Los Angeles and San Diego. The workshop was an attempt to resolve fundamental problems which the staff of the Filipino Component of the AABC observed in visits to bilingual programs in San Francisco, Daly City, Stockton, Los Angeles and Hawaii. The staff had spoken to Filipino teachers in these programs, and to the members of the Filipino Community in general. Problems and needs of these programs were assessed. The staff felt that the basic problems revolved around the Pilipino language itself. Very important considerations, fundamental to the Filipino situation in the United States, had become clear: 1) Filipino children in bilingual schools have different levels of familiarity with Pilipino. Some children speak Tagalog in the home, others hear it spoken but do not use it, and still others speak a different language or dialect altogether. 2) Filipino teachers have different levels of familiarity with Pilipino. 3) There is a disagreement on what Pilipino vocabulary should be studied.

The workshop was divided into two sessions. The first session was given by a panel of three speakers. Dr. Rolando Santos, of the Title VII National Advisory Committee for Bilingual Education, emphasized the needs of children in bilingual programs who have varying levels of proficiency in the language. He stated:

> "The Bilingual Education Act requires the use of a child's home language if instruction is to be meaningful. Purity of language or the mongrelization of a language by borrowing from other languages seems to be an academic issue. The central issue seems to be what work or phrase has most meaning to the child whether it is based on Tagalog, English, Spanish or any other language.

N.V.M. Gonzalez, professor of Literature at the California State University at Hayward, related that:

Everyone owns a language. Therefore, the Filipino people own the Pilipino language. No matter where the Filipino may be, it is only right that Pilipino should flourish, and likened to a plant, it should have a bountiful harvest.

Teresito M. Laygo, former associate professor of Mathematics and Education at the Ateneo de Manila in the Philippines, presented a systematic approach to the adoption of technical terms in Pilipino that may be used in science and mathematics. This approach was based on the "Maugnayin Pilipino na Pang-Agham", which the "Lupon sa Agham" of the Philippine National Science Development Board has been developing since 1964. Laygo asked "How can one say in Pilipino that a child understands: 'A set of finite number of elements results from the union of two finite sets?'"

The second session was a group discussion. The group wanted a more concrete definition of bilingual education as mandated by the E.S.E.A. Title VII, a continued study of "What is Pilipino?" and a further investigation of the basic and technical Pilipino words. More participation by Filipino Bilingual Programs in the United States and a network of communications were desired.

The group felt that the workshop brought to the fore its preferences among words used interchangeably in Pilipino. Gleaned from the responses of the participants to the questionnaire regarding their choice of vocabulary, it is clear that the Pilipino of the group leaned a bit towards Spanish orientation. Furthermore, the group felt that the workshop was an attempt to develop a feedback network for the use of Pilipino in bilingual education.

S C H E D U L E

10:00 a.m. - 10:15 a.m.	Registration
10:15 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.	Introductory Session
10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	What is Pilipino?
	Speakers: N.V.M. Gonzales
	Rolando Santos
	Teresito Laygo
12:00 p.m. - 1:00 p.m.	Lunch
1:00 p.m. - 1:45 p.m.	Group Discussion
1:45 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.	Summary - Group Discussion
2:00 p.m. - 2:15 p.m.	Evaluation
2:15 p.m. - 2:45 p.m.	Organization of Feedback Network
2:45 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.	Summary of Activities

FILIPINO COMPONENT

ABSTRACTS OF THE TALK OF THE PANEL OF SPEAKERS

Ang wika ay ariin ng lahat. Samakatuwid, ariin ang Pilipino ng sambayanang Pilipino. Saan mang dako mananatili o mapapatapon ang Pilipino ay siyang lugar na karapat-dapat paglalaguan ng wikang Pilipino at kung baga nga sa tanim, ay siya na ring pagbubuhatan ng malusog at mayamang ani.

N.V.M. Gonzalez

The Bilingual Education Act requires the use of a child's home language if instruction is to be meaningful. Purity of the language or the mongrelization of a language by borrowing from other languages seem to be an academic issue.

The central issue seems to be what word or phrase has the most meaning to the child whether it is based on Tagalog, English or Spanish or any other language.

Dr. Rolando Santos

A group of Filipino scientists, linguists and educators believe that there is a necessity for the development of scientific terminologies in Pilipino. With some encouragement from the National Science Development Board, this group has been meeting since 1965 to discuss and vote upon the terminology presented by a subcommittee on research. To date, more than thirty thousand terms have been approved and included in the "Maugnayin Talasalitaang Pang-Agham". What is the "Maugnayin Talasalitaan Pang-Agham"? How do we say in Pilipino: "A set with finite number of elements is the result of the union of two finite sets".

Teresito M. Laygo

WORD LIST

The following are some words often used interchangeably in Pilipino. Please check your preference.

ENGLISH		PILIPINO TERMS	
green	___lunti	___berde	
blue	___bughaw	___asul	
barrio	___nayon	___baryo	
book	___aklat	___libro	
culture	___kalinangan	___kultura	
center	___lunduyan	___sentro	
community	___pamayanan	___komunidad	
family	___mag-anak	___pamilya	

shoot (a ball)	___ibuslo	___isiyut	___i-shoot
to develop	___linangin	___debelopin	___mag-develop
examination	___pagsusulit	___eksaminasyon	___"examination"
curriculum	___talaaralan	___kurikulum	___"curriculum"
dialect	___wikain	___dayalek	___"dialect"

cognitive	___pang-isipan	___kognitibo	___kognitib	___"cognitive"
affective	___pandandamin	___apektibo	___apektib	___"affective"
psychomotor	___pangkatawanin	___saykomotor	___saykomotor	___"psychomotor"
square	___parisukat	___kwadrado	___iskwer	___"square"
triangle	___tatsulok	___trayanggulo	___trayanggel	___"triangle"
to review	___magbalik-aral	___magrepaso	___magrebyu	___mag-review
to experiment	___tilawin	___eksperimen-tuhin	___eksperimen-tin	___experimentin

arithmetic	____bilnuran	____aritmetika	____aritmetik	____"arithmetic"
mathematics	____sipnayan	____matematika	____matematik	____"mathematics"
geography	____taladutaan	____heyograpiya	____dyograpi	____"geography"
angle	____siha	____anggulo	____anggel	____"angle"
school	____paaralan	____eskuwelahan	____iskul	____"school"

market	____pamilihan	____palengke	____tiyangge	____merkado
flag	____watawat	____bandila	____bandera	
cabinet	____iskaparate	____aparador	____kabinet	
score	____puntos	____iskor	____"score"	
to dive	____dumaib	____mag-dive		

orange (color)	Concept	Idea	Bilingual
____kulay dalanghita	____kaisipan	____hagap	____dalwika
____narangha	____konsepto	____ideya	____bilingguwal
____orens	____konsep	____kurukuro	____baylingguwal
____"orange"	____"concept"	____"idea"	____"bilingual"
____pulaw	____dalumat	____kaisipan	____duhangwika

COMMENTS:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

PILIPINO WORDS CHOSEN BY THE PARTICIPANTS

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS: 27

I. Terms which are overwhelmingly chosen by the participants are listed below. At least 2/3 of the participants chose these terms.

Green	-	Berde
Blue	-	Asul
Culture	-	Kultura
Center	-	Sentro
Community	-	Komunidad
Family	-	Pamilya
Market	-	Palengke
Flag	-	Bandila
Curriculum	-	Kurikulum
Square	-	Kuwadrado
To experiment	-	Experimentuhin
Mathematics	-	Matematika

II. Words where the choices are divided are given below in the order they were chosen. At least 1/3 of the participants chose the leading word in a pair of words.

Barrio	-	Baryo, nayon
Book	-	Libro, aklat
Dialect	-	Dayalek, Wikain
Arithmetic	-	Aritmetika, aritmetic
To develop	-	Linangin, debelopin
Examination	-	Pagsusulit, eksaminasyon
Score	-	Puntos, iskor
To dive	-	Dumaib, mag-dive
School	-	Paaralan, eskuwelahan

III. The following list contains the words where the 1/3 criterion was not met. This implies that there was no strong preference for any word. The list is presented in the order of choice.

Orange (color)	-	Kulay dalanghita, narangha
Concept	-	Kaisipan, consepto
Idea	-	Ideya, Kaisipan
Bilingual	-	"Bilingual", bilinggwal, baylinggwal
Cognitive	-	Pang-isipan, Kognitibo
Affective	-	Apektibo, pandandamin, "affective"
Psychomotor	-	Saykomotor
Triangle	-	Trayanggulo, tatsulok
To review	-	Magbalik-aral, magrepaso, magrebyu
Shoot (a ball)	-	Isiyut, i-shoot
Cabinet	-	Aparador, kabinet
Geography	-	Dyograpi, "geography"
Angle	-	Anggulo, "angle"

What is Pilipino?

Workshop
November 15, 1975

A. This workshop has been an attempt to discover/develop

1. Preferences among words interchangeably used in Pilipino. 1 2 3 4 5

(Circle one number, 1 is the lowest rating, 5 the highest)

2. A working guide for everyday Pilipino. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Approaches to developing technical terminology. 1 2 3 4 5

4. A feedback network for the use of Pilipino in bilingual education.

B. Which part of the workshop did you find most beneficial?

_____

_____

What areas would you like expanded?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Your general comments about the in-service:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

What is Pilipino?

Workshop
November 15, 1975

A. This workshop has been an attempt to discover/develop

1. Preferences among words interchangeably used in Pilipino.

1	2	3	4	5
[0]	[2]	[6]	[7]	[7]

(Circle one number, 1 is the lowest rating, 5 the highest)

2. A working guide for everyday Pilipino.

1	2	3	4	5
[2]	[6]	[5]	[4]	[5]

3. Approaches to developing technical terminology.

1	2	3	4	5
[6]	[5]	[4]	[5]	[2]

4. A feedback network for the use of Pilipino in bilingual education.

B. Which part of the workshop did you find most beneficial?
1) Group discussion
2) Views of the speakers on the panel

What areas would you like expanded?

1) A more concrete definition of bilingual, bi-cultural programs mandated by Title VII, goals and guidelines for implementations of the program, and how the program affects the community

2) More on what is Pilipino?; basic and technical words in Pilipino.

3) More parents participation and network for communication.

4) Assessment of the needs of the child.

5) Task force advisory committee.

Your general comments about the in-service:

1) Excellent, well planned, productive, beneficial, interesting.

2) Workshop not long enough.

3) Some people argue much on simple issues.

DIRECTORY OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

NAMES	ORGANIZATION/PROJECT	ADDRESS
Milagros A. Alegria	Hawaiian Avenue Elementary School - Pilipino Bilingual/ Bicultural Education	26114 Eshelman Avenue Lomita, CA 90717
Aurora R. Almendral	Stockton Unified School District	701 N. Madison Avenue Stockton, CA 95202
Belen Balaba	Oakland Public Schools	2988 El Monte Avenue Oakland, CA 94605
Reina Bautista	Title VII, San Francisco Unified School District	75 San Miguel Avenue Daly City, CA 94015
Danilo Begonia	San Francisco State University	1600 Holloway San Francisco, CA 94132
Cynthia A. Bonta	TAFT/ESAA	2918 Regent Street #N Berkeley, CA 94705
M. C. Catolico	Mountain View High School	1054 Wright Avenue Mountain View, CA 94043
Hand Chu	Asian, Incorporated	1610 Bush Street San Francisco, CA 94109
Virginia B. de la Cruz	Filipino Educational Center	390-4th Street San Francisco, CA 94107
Heidi Dulay	Asian American Bilingual Center	2168 Shattuck Avenue Berkeley, CA 94704
Lourdes Fernando	San Diego State Institute for Cultural Pluralism	College Avenue San Diego, CA 92115
Medlinda R. Gayares	Filipino Educational Center	390-4th Street San Francisco, CA 94107
Jaime Gaega		508-31st Street #4 Oakland, CA 94609
W. D. Kent	Concerned Citizen	c/o 26114 Eshelman Lomita, CA 90717
Aurora N. C. Manning	Concerned Filipi..	2710 Piedmont Avenue #C Berkeley, CA 94705
Ben Menor	Mountain View High School	279 Matadero Avenue Palo Alto, CA 94306

NAMES	ORGANIZATION/PROJECT	ADDRESS
Vicenta Moran	Concerned Filipino of Berkeley	3148 College Avenue Berkeley, CA 94705
Eleanor Nisperos	Committee Advisory Board Member	2931 East 29th Street Oakland, CA 94601
Estela Pinga	Stockton Unified School District	8524 Yarmouth Stockton, CA 94207
Usin I. Pisingan	Westmoor High School - Advisory Board Member	131 Westmoor Avenue Daly City, CA 94015
Dominga J. Portugal	Bilingual Resource Center	Lincoln High School Annex 22nd & Rivera San Francisco, CA 94116
Sofia Prudenciado	Filipino Bilingual - San Francisco Unified School District	Board of Education 135 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102
Asuncion N. Pulido	Filipino Bilingual	1122-F Gateview Avenue Treasure Island San Francisco, CA 94130
Eliodoro G. Robles	Title VII, ESEA, Filipino Bilingual, San Francisco Unified School District	283 Gold Mine Drive San Francisco, CA 94131
Sorcy Rocamora	BABEL/LAU	1423 Grove Street #2 Berkeley, CA 94709
Erna A. Reyes	Oakland Public Schools	1516-27th Avenue Oakland, CA 94607
Luchi Simpao	Berkeley Unified School District	1643 Bancroft Way Berkeley, CA 94703
Val Sugayan	Concerned Filipino	1718 Stuart Berkeley, CA 94703
Tagumpay C. Yumang	Westmoor High School	131 Westmoor Avenue Daly City, CA 94015

Appendix B

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS LEADING TO THE ADOPTION OF A BILINGUAL POLICY IN THE PHILIPPINES

TERESITO M. LAYGO

1925: Monroe Commision (a commission that examined the achievements of the public school system in the Philippines after 25 years of education in English) claimed that:

> "...there is little or no tendency toward building up a common language through a fusion of all or several of the dialects..."
> "...the introduction of the dialects as the language of instruction would be a divisive influence."
>
> (Monroe, Paul, Chairman. Survey of the Educational System of the Philippines. Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1975.)

1935: The adopted Commonwealth Constitution of the Philippines provided that the National Assembly should take steps for the development of a national language.

1940: A law was passed declaring the national language to be an official language of the Philippines effective July 4, 1946.

1948-54: An experiment on the use of the vernacular as the language of instruction was conducted in Iloilo elementary schools by Dr. Jose V. Aguilar. The experiment grew out of many factors and desires, the most important of which was the need to improve the life of the average Filipino citizen through the community school. It was thought that, with the use of the vernacular, both parent and child would benefit because what is learned in school could be discussed with the parent and because what is happening in the community could be discussed in school. The experiment proved the superiority of the vernacular as the language of instruction in the initial stage of education, in terms of what the child should learn, and in his social growth.

1950-58: The coming of age in the Philippines of linguistics and second language teaching.

1955: The establishment of the Board of National Education which determines educational policy matters in the Philippines. (Note: The name "Board of National Education" was changed to "National Board of Education" with the initials NBE in 1970.)

1956: The Secretary of Education allowed twenty-two school divisions to use their respective vernaculars.

1957: The start of the use of vernaculars as languages of instruction in the first two grades.

1959: The term "Pilipino" was officially adopted to refer to the national language.

1960-66: Two large-scale experiments were conducted jointly by the Philippine Center for Language Study and the Bureau of Public Schools.

(Davis, Fredrick B. Philippine Language Teaching Experiments. Quezon City: Phoenix Press, 1967.)

I. Rizal Experiment (1960-66)

Involved were: 30 teachers
1,490 pupils
30 schools

Length of experiment: 6 years

Findings:

1. It is advisable to introduce reading in English in Grade 1 (in the 4th month), instead of Grade 2 as advocated by a number of authorities in the field of second-language teaching.

2. Of the three schemes in the use of English and the vernacular in the first years of school:

   a) pupils taught in all-English curriculum in Grades 1 to 6 produced the best results;
   b) those taught in the vernacular for four years and then in English in Grades 5 and 6 were the next best;
   c) the pupils taught in the prevailing scheme of two years in the vernacular

and English in Grades 3 through 6 came out the poorest.

II. Second Iloilo Experiment

This experiment justified the use of the vernacular and the simultaneous teaching of two second languages, English and Pilipino, in non-Tagalog speaking provinces.

The experiment proved the value of (1) adequately trained teachers, (2) carefully prepared materials, and (3) excellent supervision.

The experiment disproved the notion that the teaching or use of three languages simultaneously would confuse the child.

1967-68: Debates on the "What is Pilipino" issue.

Aquedo Agbayani, chairman of the Congressional Committee on Education and member of the Board of National Education, accused the Institute of National Language of failure to develop a national language in the thirty years of its existence. Congressional hearings conducted by committees on education and national language brought forth the "purists" and the "anti-purists" led by Geruncio Lacuesta.

Taliba, a national language newspaper in Manila, started using "conversational or colloquial Filipino" --simple Tagalog, which has borrowings from English and Spanish.

1968: Language Policy Survey started by Philippine Normal College Language Study Center, directed by Dr. Fe T. Otanes.

Findings: (From 221 Manila & suburbs respondents: 130 householders, 91 teachers.)

1. The favored language used in speaking to relatives (contacts) is Tagalog, while the favored language of contact in writing is English.

2. Most Manilans read in Tagalog and in English, but more people read in Tagalog than in English, inspite of the large circulation of newspapers and magazines in English.

3. Tagalog is spoken by 71%; Ilocano by 3%, and each of the other languages by less than 3%.

4. Knowledge of Pilipino is necessary for success in carpentry, farming, fishing, selling (in the market) and housekeeping.

   Knowledge of Pilipino and English is necessary for success in occupations such as clerk, physician, electrician, lawyer, mayor, mid-wife, policeman, postman, priest, secretary, and seller (big stores).

   Knowledge of only Spanish or only a non-Tagalog Philippine Language would not succeed in any of the occupations listed.

   Knowledge of Pilipino, English and Spanish would mean success for lawyers, priest and physicians.

   Conclusion: If one were to choose only one language for success, it would be Pilipino.

1969: Pilipino, as the language of instruction, was proposed by the Board of National Education.

1970: National Board of Education passed Resolution No. 70-5 on Feb. 17, 1970, which promulgated the gradual implementation of Pilipino as medium of instruction in the elementary school, from Grade 1, beginning school year 1972-73. On August 18, 1970, the Board passed Resolution No. 70-21 paving the way for Pilipino as medium of instruction in courses such as Rizal, History and Government, in all colleges and universities.

1971: New Constitution provided that the National Assembly (which was abolished by the 1976 referendum before it was constituted) shall take steps towards the development and forward the adoption of a common language to be known as Filipino.

1973: The National Board of Education passed Resolution No. 73-7 which outlined the policy on bilingual education.

1974: The Department of Education issued Department Order No. 25, S. 1974, containing the implementing guidelines for the policy on bilingual education.

1975: The Department of Education issued Department Order No. 50, S. 1975, containing supplemental implementing guidelines for the policy on bilingual instruction at tertiary institutions.

Appendix C

A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE MAUGNAYIN METHOD OF AMALGAMATION
(As used by the Lupon sa Agham since 1965)

---

1. "Selective amalgamation" rather than "indiscriminate amalgamation" is employed.

2. Selective amalgamation is being done around Tagalog as core language, particularly with respect to grammar, with the other Philippine languages as participating languages, especially with respect to vocabulary. Amalgamation without a core language is impractical.

3. Selective amalgamation is being done initially on the technical and scientific levels, where systematic vocabulary selections from the other languages have the best chances of quick acceptance.

4. Gradually and naturally, the amalgamating words wide-spread down to the popular level.

5. The popular level in language development is respected but is recognized as being slow, uncontrollable, unpredictable and unreliable, and as having a tendency to produce slang and colloquialisms instead of orderly and consistent terminology.

6. The technical and scientific meanings of amalgamating words are made identical or as closely related as possible to their original and ordinary meanings.

7. All basic and abstract concepts in science are being expressed with national language terms derived from Philippine (or Filipinized) root words using the affixes, combining forms and morphology of the core language.

8. Non-basic and non-abstract names of objects, plants, animals, measurements, astronomical bodies, chemical elements, materials, etc., are being directly borrowed from foreign languages whenever acceptable equivalents do not exist in any Philippine language.

9. Actual translation of foreign scientific and technical terms into maugnayin terminology of the amalgamated national language is already being done by various subcommittees of the Lupon sa Agham composed of educators, scientists and professionals who are experts in the relevant fields, assisted by the Lupon's vocabulary research subcommittee which is composed of experts with scientific and/or technological training plus a working knowledge of modern linguistics.

Appendix D

HIGHLIGHTS OF CONSTANTINO'S PAPER ON "UNIVERSAL APPROACH"

The "universal approach" is the method recommended by the linguists of the University of the Philippines (U.P.) in developing a Philippine national language. According to what has been formulated in U.P. the "universal approach" aims to develop a Philippine national language based not only on one language but on many languages.

Two reasons why U.P. decided to adopt the universal approach: 1) there has been a continuing problem of accepting or recognizing Pilipino as the national language by the Filipinos themselves. 2) Members of the constitutional convention (who would eventually become members of the National Assembly*) were determined to stop the use of Pilipino as the national language and to change this to a new one based on a few or more languages of the Philippines.

Some factors that encouraged the linguists at U.P. to prepare this universal approach were the new developments in linguistics, education, and mass media which strengthened the possibility of using not only one language but one group of languages as bases for a national language, if this could answer the desire of the citizenry for national identity and integration. Likewise, they were encouraged by the observation of one scholar who had an extensive knowledge of national languages, that, if they considered the point of view of linguistics, the development of a national language based on one or more languages or the acceptance of a new one would continue endlessly as long as the economic possibilities and the political or nationalistic cravings for this national language were effective.

*The National Assembly as embodied in the 1972 Philippine Constitution was abolished before it was commenced by the people in a general referendum of 1976. Instead, a Sangguniang Pambansa was created.

Principles of the "Universal Approach"

1. The national language of the Philippines should be based not on one but on several Philippine languages, but this does not eliminate the possibility of making one a nucleus of the national language.

2. In the choice of elements or forms that may be included in the national language (such as sounds, words, affixes, grammatical constructions, etc.), preference should be given to the elements or forms used by the majority of the languages. For example, if X and Y are synonymous words used in the Philippine languages (but having difficult forms), and X are used by 50 languages/dialects and Y are used by 30, preference should be given to X in forming a vocabulary of the national language.

3. The national language may use, especially in the initial stage, groups of synonymous words, and if possible, no more than four words should be in a group.

Methods Used in the "Universal Approach"

Two methods may be used in the development of a national language under the "universal approach": Method A and Method B. Method A begins with the development of a national language based on several languages simultaneously; and Method B begins with only one base. The processes followed by both methods are as follows:

1. As a first step, a universal alphabet must be adopted.* This alphabet together with spelling rules for easy reading will be used.

2. Step two will be the writing of a universal grammar of Philippine languages. In order to write this grammar, it is necessary to list properly the deep and surface structures of the grammar of Philippine languages/dialects.

---

* The Surian ng Wikang Pambansa adopted a 31-letter alphabet -- the Spanish alphabet, plus ng -- to be the official Pilipino alphabet on October 4, 1971.

3. The third step follows as soon as the universal grammar is written. If Method A is followed, a universal dictionary or thesaurus of the Philippine languages/dialects will be made. At the beginning, this dictionary will contain all words that have been collected from Philippine languages/dialects; synonymous words will be grouped together and placed in the dictionary as a single entry according to the form explained in step four. Thus, at the outset, almost all the words in the universal dictionary will have synonyms and many in the group of synonyms will have more than five words.

If Method B is used, words from the language chosen as the nucleus will form the initial dictionary of the national language and to make this a universal dictionary it will be enriched in the succeeding five years with words from other languages/dialects, native or foreign, and will be used often in accordance with the rules explained in the fourth step.

4. As soon as the universal dictionary is finished or even while it is being made, standardization of the dictionary will be accomplished according to the following steps:

a. All synonyms used by less than one-half to one-third of the languages/dialect entered into this dictionary will be removed, excepting the synonyms used by a large ethnic group such as Tagalog, Cebuano, Ilokano or Tausug. This rule may also be followed for a group of synonyms with only two members.
b. As much as possible the maximum number of members per group of synonyms should be four.
c. Words often used, such as articles, particles or markers of grammatical relations shall have no synonyms.

For a group of synonyms in the universal dictionary preference is given to the member used by a majority of languages/dialects or used by the nucleus language. Only the preferred word shall be defined and the others shall be considered as synonyms of the word.

Words in the universal dictionary shall be pronounced in the same way they are pronounced in the original language. In a group of synonyms spelled differently (even if the pronunciation is identical), preference will be given to the spelling of the word used by a majority of languages/dialects or spelled in accordance with the spelling rules in the universal alphabet. Other spellings would be considered variants.

Both dictionary and grammar shall be reviewed and revised accordingly, after, but not exceeding a period of ten years, to be updated with the language development, to be enriched or to be improved.

A compromise Method C that is between Method A and B is also possible. In this method, two up to eight languages may be used as the base. Vocabulary of the other languages/ dialects may be added to the dictionary within a five-year period.

Characteristics of the New National Language

1. It will be a language of the Philippines, for it has the same sound, vocabulary and grammar. Its basic structure is the same as the underlying structure of the other Philippine languages/dialects. Seeming difference in structure is only superficial.

2. The language formed will not have any element or form which is not in the Philippine languages/dialects. However, there may be some superficial element and form possessed by a particular language/dialect which are absent in the newly formed language.

3. Just as any language, this new language will be alive the moment this is used. It will not become an artificial or a dead language.

4. If Method A or Method C is followed, it is possible that the new language formed will not have a native speaker and thus this may be branded as an artificial language. But if Method B is followed, the newly formed language is a natural language actually spoken by the people of today, especially if based on the so-called U.P. Pilipino.

5. It will be noted from the above discussion that no word or element will be invented in the new language for this is not necessary in the universal approach. Nor will it be necessary to resurrect the native vocabulary which has been obsolete due to non-usage.

Appendix E

BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE PHILIPPINES

TERESITO M. LAYGO

INTRODUCTION

Bilingualism is not new in the Philippines. What is new is the official policy promulgated by the National Board of Education on bilingual education. Let us look at the bases of the policy on bilingual education.

There are three provisions on language in the new Philippine Constitution. Article XV under General Provisions states:

> Sec. 3 (1) This Constitution shall be promulgated in English and in Pilipino, and translated into each dialect spoken by over fifty thousand people, and into Spanish and Arabic.
> (2) The National Assembly shall take steps towards the development and adoption of a common language to be known as Filipino (underscoring mine).
> (3) Until otherwise provided by law, English and Pilipino shall be official languages.

Commenting on the contents of Article XV, Section 3 of the new Constitution, President Marcos said: "It is clear that there should be two official languages - English and Pilipino. . . Therefore, our administration is supporting the policy of bilingualism. . . And so, the National Board of Education should make the policy clear, and the Department of Education and Culture should implement this policy. . ." (from President Marcos' speech at the closing ceremony of the 9th National Workshop in Pilipino, held at Marikina School of Arts and Trades, May 7-11, 1973).

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL BOARD OF EDUCATION

On August 7, 1973, the National Board of Education passed Resolution No. 73-7, which outlines the policy on bilingual education. The resolution states in part:

> . . . That English and Pilipino serve as media of instruction and be taught as subjects in the curriculum from Grade I to the university level in all schools, public and private; and . . .

> Resolved further, that the Department of Education and Culture be requested to prepare and submit for consideration and approval by the Board, an implementing scheme or policy guidelines, which should include:
>
> a. subject areas to be taught in English, Pilipino, or in both languages;
> b. schedule of implementation;
> c. preparation of instructional materials.

In a speech delivered during the National Language week (August 14-20, 1973), President Marcos stated:

> . . . I am pleased with the decision of the National Board of Education passed just seven days ago. This concerns the bilingual use of Pilipino and English as media of instruction, aside from being separate subjects from the elementary grades up. This decision, in fact, is in accordance with my wish which I made in a statement before the supervisors and teachers of the national language in their conference last May. We might wish it were Pilipino alone but practical considerations demand that we also train our youth in English for other particular needs . . . This step, I wish to stress, is one of the reforms being undertaken by the Administration. . . .

DEPARTMENT ORDER NO. 25, S. 1974

The Department of Education and Culture has given the go-signal for the implementation of the National policy on bilingualism in schools as enunciated by the National Board of Education.

In Department Order No. 25, series of 1974, promulgated on June 19, 1974, the DEC spelled out, in consonance with this policy, a set of implementing guidelines "to develop a bilingual nation competent in the use of both English and Pilipino."

These implementing guidelines advocate:

1. The separate use of Pilipino and English as media of instruction in definite subject areas. Arabic, however, shall be used as an additional language in areas where its use is necessary.

2. That the use of English and Pilipino as media of instruction begin in Grade 1 in all schools. In Grade 1 and 2, the vernacular used in the locality or place where the school is located shall be the auxiliary medium of instruction; this use of the

vernacular shall be resorted to only when necessary to facilitate understanding of the concepts being taught through the prescribed medium for the subject, English, Pilipino or Arabic, as the case may be.

3. That English and Pilipino be taught as language subjects in all grades in the elementary and secondary schools to achieve the goal of bilingualism.

4. That Pilipino be used as medium of instruction in the following subject areas: social studies/social science, character education, work education, health education and physical education.

5. That new textbook and other instructional materials be developed for English and Pilipino language courses/subjects aimed at developing competence in the use of these languages.

6. That new textbooks in the subject areas requiring Pilipino as medium of instruction be written only in Pilipino.

The implementation of the policy on bilingualism is divided into two phases:

1. Phase I: School year 1974-75 through school year 1977-78.

This four-year period shall be a transition period in the use of Pilipino as the medium of instruction for the following subjects: social studies/social science, work education, character education, health education and physical education. Schools in the Tagalog areas may begin the use of Pilipino during this period while schools in other areas shall develop plans for either an immediate or gradual shift to Pilipino as the medium of instruction, depending on the availability of teaching materials and teachers competent to teach in Pilipino. English shall remain as the medium of instruction for all other courses.

2. Phase II: School year 1978-79 through school year 1981-82.

During this period, the use of Pilipino in such subjects as social studies/social science, character education, work education, health education and physical education shall be:

1. Mandatory, beginning with the school year 1978-79, in schools in the Tagalog areas, and other schools that made the shift to Pilipino during school year 1974-75.

2. Mandatory in all other schools in accordance with the following schedule:

Primary:	School year 1978-79
Intermediate:	School year 1979-80
First and Second year high school:	School year 1980-81
Third and Fourth year high school:	School year 1981-82

The use of English in all other subjects/courses in the elementary and secondary levels shall likewise be mandatory.

To implement this mandate, the Department of Education and Culture directed the organization of in-service training programs, with the cooperation of teachers colleges and universities, on the national, regional, and local levels, aimed at developing teachers' competence in the use of Pilipino as a medium of instruction.

All schools were also directed to prepare long-ranged plans for teacher in-service training and for materials acquisition and/or preparation.

Finally, tertiary institutions were given freedom to develop their own schedules of implementation provided that by the school year 1984, all graduates of tertiary curricula should be able to pass examinations in English and/or Pilipino for the practice of their profession.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION DECENTRALIZED

To facilitate the implementation of the bilingual policy, the reorganization of the Department of Education, as recommended by the Presidential Commission to survey Philippine Education, has been effected. The Bureau of Public Schools and the Bureau of Private Schools were abolished. Instead, the Bureau of Elementary Education, the Bureau of Secondary Education and the Bureau of Higher Education now share to discharge the functions of the defunct bureaus. The Department of Education and Culture has been decentralized. A regional director, who heads each region, has full jurisdiction of all schools, public and private, within the region. No longer does a local matter go to Manila. Problems affecting only a specific region are decided in that region.

IMPLICATIONS OF BILINGUALISM IN THE PHILIPPINES

Briefly, for the successful and speedy implementation of the policy for bilingual education in the Philippines there should be:

1. Intensive as well as extensive in-service teacher education;

2. A new curriculum in pre-service teacher education designed;

3. More people trained to be and employed as curriculum writers;

4. Further research and experiments conducted on the various aspects of bilingual education;

5. Continuing effort directed toward faster and finer development of the Filipino language.

Bilingualism in the Philippines brings a lot of problems too. I believe the major problem lies in the Filipino language itself. What will be "Filipino", the language provided for in the new Constitution? As of now, there are at least two language movements in the Philippines:

1. The Maugnayin Pilipino movement, which designed the "maugnayin" method of amalgamating the Philippine languages. This group contends that there should be a specific term for every scientific concept, and that there should be, at least three levels of communication on Pilipino, namely, the ordinary conversational, the literary, and the scientific.

2. The movement that advocated Ernesto Constantino's "Pilipino ng U.P.". A sample of Constantino's Filipino is as follows:

   "Pilipino ng U.P."

   "Ang titser ay pumasok sa klasrum upang isulat sa blakbord ang asaynment."

   Pilipino (as used in many Philippine schools):

   "Ang guro ay pumasok sa silid aralan upang isulat sa pisara ang takdang aralin."

   Constantino's Filipino is the layman's Manila conversational Pilipino, which is similar to the Maugnayin's lowest level of communication.

As educators of Filipino-American children, how do we stand on the language issue?

REFERENCES

Surian Ng Wikang Pambansa, Ang Wika Sa Kaunlarang Pangkultura. Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1974.

National Media Production Center, New Philippines, XVIII (1), August, 1974.

Department of Education and Culture, Department Order No. 25, series of 1974, dated June 19, 1974. "Implementing Guidelines for the Policy on Bilingual Education."

"Pilipino o Filipino?", Maria Theresa Hembrador. Philippine Collegian, July 15, 1974.

Appendix F

TYPES OF BILINGUAL PROGRAMS IN THE PHILIPPINES

Elementary School:

Type A

Math and Science are taught in both Pilipino and English.

Language (English)

- Language and spelling, reading and phonics, speaking and writing; taught in English.

Language (Pilipino); taught in Pilipino.

Note: Vernacular may be used as an auxiliary medium of instruction in Grade I and Grade II.

Type B

Pilipino is the sole medium of instruction.

Pilipino and English are taught as separate subjects.

Secondary School:

Type A

Math and Sciences are taught in English, with Pilipino as supplementary medium.

Pilipino Communication Arts in Pilipino

English Communication Arts in English

All other subjects are taught in Pilipino, although English may be used as a supplementary medium.

Type B

All subjects would be taught in Pilipino with English as a supplementary medium.

Pilipino and English would be taught as seperate subjects.

Tertiary School:

Communication Arts and Pilipino Literature - Pilipino (9 units)

Communication Arts and English Literature - English (9 units)

Social Science and Philippine Culture - preferably in Pilipino, depending on the skill of the teacher.

All other courses - Pilipino or English may be the primary or auxiliary medium of instruction.

The activity which is the subject of this publication was supported in whole or part by the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.